

# THE CONGREGATIONAL REVIEW.

VOL. VII.—JULY, 1867.—No. 37.

---

## ARTICLE I.

### JUSTIFICATION AND SANCTIFICATION.

WE have placed these two titles in this connection for the sake of indicating, with precision, the differences between the doctrines which they represent. These differences are not generally apparent to the popular mind, nor always to the theologically instructed. They are not speculative differences, but relate to distinct facts. They are not unimportant differences, but, on the other hand, of gravely practical character.

Both Justification and Sanctification respect the facts of sin and salvation. But they bound these, so to speak, on opposite sides. They alike belong to the Christian soteriology; but their relation in this is as antecedent and consequent, as the staple and its depending chain.

The very common confusion which regards these acts or experiences as substantially identical, has several causes. They both have the same final purpose, which is human salvation. They are not separated initially, in point of time, but are connected, as a river with its fountain. Each is a divine operation, in general terms. Thus they are taken to be the same, or parts of the same, thing. To these sources of confusion must be added a crude but extensive misconception of the essential law of the religious life—that it is making people better in physical development, personal habits, culture of intellect and taste, toning of the affections, control of the will; ed-

uating them out of one stage of civilization into a higher. To such a view of "the spiritual man," these biblical terms, which we are discriminating, mean nothing more than a general reformation of manners and feelings. The first is wholly obsolete—one of the driest of the stuffed skins of the theological museum. The second is kept as a convenient pietistic name of what after all is considered a very natural transition; to gratify good people who are mystically inclined, and to meet the occasional exigencies of stimulated religious sensibilities.

This obscuring of the motive forces and essential nature of the Christian life, finds an ally in a somewhat prevalent dislike, even among Christians themselves, to a close analysis of the doctrines of grace. The unmeaning antithesis of which we have heard so much—that Christianity is a life and not a doctrine, which is much the same as saying, that man is a soul and not a body—has helped to confound yet more the justifying and the sanctifying grace of God. The fashion is, to take salvation in mass, and not to study its details; to appropriate redemption as a whole, without separating its action into its several stages. This very unintelligent way of treating a subject of such explicit divine revelation, is little worthy the gravity of the theme, however in keeping with the surface thinking of the day upon all save material interests. Not to pause here upon this suggestive topic, there is one other cause of an indistinct conception of these correlated truths, which has a profounder root.

Theological science has approached the question of human salvation through two main avenues: whether to find, in this, a remedy for human guilt, or human corruption. Regarding redemption mainly as an antidote for the corruption of the soul through sin, the mind will fasten mostly upon the work of the Holy Spirit as the agent of spiritual purification; his re-creating power will become its absorbing idea of the new life in man; and while it does not set aside the justifying act of God, it will hardly escape the error of considering the soul's justification as only the first stage of its sanctification, and as partly depending on this, instead of the necessary introduction to its sanctification. This, as Professor Shedd explains in his *History of Christian Doctrine*, was the mistake of Augustine, as it had been of many of the Greek theologians. Not overlooking the

guilty perverseness of the will of fallen man, he was led, both from his own early profligacy, and by his controversy with the Pelagian dogmas of human native innocence and recuperative forces, more especially to contemplate the need "of the soul's renovation by divine influence. . . . The need of grace in the form of a renewing, strengthening, and purifying power, had been very vividly and painfully felt by him." Thus he came to confuse justification with sanctification through this attraction of his attention to "that side of the general doctrine of redemption which relates to the delivery of the soul from the power and pollution, as distinguished from the guilt and condemnation, of sin"; a defect which both Luther and Calvin detected and exposed in the writings of that theological leader of the Latin church, and from which a better understanding of Holy Scripture and fallen human nature saved his successor Anselm.<sup>1</sup>

This, then, is our guiding clue. Justification respects directly the bearing of our Saviour's expiatory atonement upon the guilt of man, the sinner. Sanctification respects directly the purifying influence of God the Holy Ghost upon the corruption of the human soul. Guilt is specifically the basis or cause of our condemnation as wilful violators of the law of God. It is that for which God's justice arraigns us at his sovereign bar, and on which the sentence of punishment has gone forth. Corruption is the taint, the contamination of moral evil in us. Guilt belongs to a wicked self-will opposing God's supreme will. Corruption inheres in the passions, appetites, affections—the sensuous nature thus vitiated into the sensual. It is the office of the Justifier to set us right on the point of past disloyalty, before the Lord, the King. It is the office of the Sanctifier to cleanse us from all impurity and iniquity.

<sup>1</sup> Thomas Aquinas, following Augustine, and advancing upon his positions, held that justification was not only the acquittal of the sinner from punishment, but also the "*infusio gratie*," infusion of divine life into the soul. This shaped the Romish doctrine thenceforward. Among Protestants, Osiander (1498—1552) represented justification and sanctification as forming only one act; but, though the controversy was vehement for many years, and this view was ably defended, it gained no permanent foothold in the Reformed churches. Within the last century, the liberalizing of the Continental and Anglo Saxon theology, in many quarters, has again obscured or obliterated these distinctions. v. Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*. Dr. H. B. Smith's Ed.: Vol. II. Index: "Justification."

\* To reduce this discrimination to yet minuter detail : Justification is a judicial or forensic *act* of God's grace, declarative of our re-instatement in his favor. It is a single act, never repeated in the same person ; while sanctification is a continuous *work* of God's grace in the spirit of man once justified.

Justification rests upon Christ's righteous sacrifice in our behalf, as the Atoner, and upon this alone ; contrary to those primitive fathers who made the grace divinely produced in man a part of his justifying cause ; and contrary to the Papal doctrine which extends that cause to saintly intercessions, and the whole trumpery of anti-Christian self-righteousness. Through sanctification, we become righteous by the help of the Spirit of God who dwelleth in us. In justification, sin is pardoned : in sanctification, holiness is begun, and is increased as sin is subdued. This distinction is not to be set aside because the after process of the subdual of unrighteousness in the believer, must be carried onward through frequent repetitions of forgiveness. No subsequent act of pardon is like that first deliverance of the contrite soul from condemnation.

Justification is complete and perfect within itself. Sanctification is never perfected until probation gives place to glory.

As related to associated doctrines, justification stands nearest, in this, to regeneration, that regeneration is the birth of the soul into the new life, and justification is the formal recognition of the fact. Sanctification comes closer, in its nature, to conversion, which enfolds the human agency of this transformation, and, unlike regeneration, may be repeated in the soul's experience. But sanctification, again, resembles regeneration in that the efficient agency of both is the inward moving of the Holy Ghost. Regeneration, conversion, sanctification, coalesce at this point, and in this logical order. Regeneration and justification, in like manner, harmonize in being single, finished, never repeated acts of God. Faith, too, is essential to both justification and sanctification : to the first—not as any part of its procuring cause ; only, as a condition precedent of its reception : to the second, as an active means of its progress. But the faith and the repentance, which are saving, are alike referable, in their origin, to the grace and gift of God.

The biblical authority for these definitions and distinctions, is



found in a large collection of texts from the Old and New Testaments, compared with each other, and interpreted in the light of strict grammatical construction, and of the logical requirements of the citations. These scriptural references are furnished in the larger catechisms, and more complete manuals of doctrine prepared for churches, and for Bible-class study. As our purpose is rather a statement than an argument, we omit giving these references, and will now furnish the reader a few of the formulas in which these doctrines are expressed in the symbols of the churches.

The Westminster divines, who are followed by the Presbyterian and Congregational churches of this country, thus teach :

“Justification is an act of God’s free grace, wherein he pardoneth all our sins, and accepteth us as righteous in his sight, only for the righteousness of Christ imputed to us and received by faith alone.”

“Sanctification is the work of God’s free grace, whereby we are renewed in the whole man after the image of God, and are enabled more and more to die unto sin, and live unto righteousness.”

In this formula, the imputation of the righteousness of Christ to believers in him, is the affirmation that Christ’s work of atonement is the sole ground on which the pardoned sinner is reckoned or accounted just before God.

The Heidelberg Catechism, which is the symbol of the Reformed churches of Holland and Germany, and of their descendants in the United States, is more paraphrastic.

“*Ques* : How art thou righteous before God ?

“*Ans* : Only by a true faith in Jesus Christ . . . God, without any merit of mine, but only of mere grace, grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ ; even so, as if I never had, nor committed any sin ; yea, as if I had fully accomplished all that obedience which Christ hath accomplished for me, inasmuch as I embraced such a benefit with a believing heart.

“*Ques* : Why sayest thou that thou art righteous by faith only ?

“*Ans* : Not that I am acceptable to God on account of the worthiness of my faith ; but only because the satisfaction, righteousness and holiness of Christ is my righteousness before God, and that I can not receive and apply the same to myself in any other way than by faith only.”

Professor Schaff, who has made this venerable Confession of Faith the basis of the catechism which he has prepared for his countrymen in America, thus condenses these doctrines of (a) Justification and (b) Sanctification :

(a.) "The act of God, by which he pardons all our sins, and applies to us the righteousness of Christ.

(b.) "Our continual growth in grace through the indwelling and power of the Holy Spirit, until we attain perfection in Christ Jesus." To which he appends this discriminating note : "The grace of God is the efficient primary *cause* of justification, the merits of Christ the *producing* cause or (objective) ground ; faith is the (subjective) *condition* on the part of man, or the instrument and organ of its appropriation. Justifying faith is not only a knowledge of the grace of God in Christ, but also a hearty confidence in the same, and a living union of the soul with Christ, so that we become partakers of his merits, and all his benefits."<sup>1</sup>

The doctrine now more commonly received in New England, regards "the satisfaction," rather than "the satisfaction, righteousness, and holiness," of Christ as the ground of justification : maintaining that his sufferings rather than his righteousness, his death rather than his holy life, is our expiation. Yet, as the Scriptures speak of his becoming "obedient unto death," it might scripturally be held that his voluntary self-offering on the cross was as really his righteous obedience as was his triumph over Satan in the desert ; that his utter absorption in the will of Deity in bowing his head and yielding up the ghost, was as essentially his holiness as was the spirit which held him in communion with God all night in prayer upon the mountain. The Reformers took a distinction between Christ's active or living, and passive or dying obedience,<sup>2</sup> in their generally accepted doctrine of the vicariousness of his entire work in the flesh for human redemption, which is the prevalent, but not universal, teaching of the Protestant churches of the present day. It was

<sup>1</sup> Dr. G. W. Bethune, in *Expository Lectures on the Heidelberg Catechism*, gives this interpretation of that symbol. "Thus the Catechism : 'God grants and imputes to me the perfect satisfaction (that is, the expiation), righteousness (that is, the obedience), and holiness (that is, the acceptableness) of Christ.' . . . God gives to the believer the legal consequences" of this, "he has the benefit of it as much as if it were his own." Vol. II. pp. 156—158.

<sup>2</sup> V. Hagenbach's *History of Doctrines*. Vol. II. 354, 355.

the original New England position. In the Boston Confession of 1680, adopted into the Saybrook symbol of 1708, it is explicitly laid down, that the basis of the sinner's justification is "Christ's active obedience unto the whole law, and passive obedience in his sufferings and death." And again: "Christ, by his obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of all those that are justified, and did by the sacrifice of himself, in the blood of his cross, undergoing in their stead the penalty due unto them, make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to God's justice in their behalf: yet, inasmuch as he was given by the Father for them, and his obedience and satisfaction accepted in their stead, and both freely, not for any thing in them, their justification is only of free grace, that both the exact justice and rich grace of God might be glorified in the justification of sinners." So the elder Edwards, with strong emphasis; but less distinctly the younger Edwards. In his writings appear the beginnings of the departure from this ground, by our divines, which was fully made by the Hopkinsian writers. While discarding, on metaphysical grounds, the distinction between Christ's active and passive obedience, President Edwards says: "There is the very same need of Christ's obeying the law in our stead, in order to the reward, as of his suffering the penalty of the law in our stead, in order to our escaping the penalty; and the same reasons why one should be accepted on our account, as the other. There is the same need of one as the other, that the law of God might be answered." . . . "As there is the same need that Christ's obedience should be reckoned to our account, as that his atonement," his death, "should; so there is the same reason why it should."<sup>1</sup> But the second Edwards holds that, while by "his sufferings unto death," Christ "made satisfaction to the law for sin," by "his perfect righteousness . . . he has exhibited to us an example; has laid a foundation for his own intercession" and rewards, "and for the bestowment of justification and eternal life on his disciples."<sup>2</sup> This is the doctrine of Emmons, that Christ's righteousness was

\* <sup>1</sup> Works of President Edwards. New York. 1844. Vol. iv. 92, 95, *et al.*

<sup>2</sup> Works of Dr. Jonathan Edwards. Andover. Vol. II. 69.

necessary to himself, to fit and to warrant him to suffer efficaciously for us a propitiatory death.

The creeds of the German churches give particular attention to "good works," the synonym of Sanctification, as the proof of a justified state: and these are defined to be: "Only those [works] which proceed from true faith are performed according to the law of God and to his glory; and not such as are founded on our imaginations, or the institutions of men." Thus, the Heidelberg Catechism; on which Professor Schaff comments: "Good works are just as necessary and indispensable in the evangelical, as they are in the Roman creed, only not as *conditions*, but as practical *fruits* or *evidences* of justification."

Turning to the Articles of the Episcopal church, we find them entirely harmonizing with the foregoing under the heads of (a) Justification; (b) Good Works; (c) Works before Justification.

(a.) "We are accounted righteous before God only for the merit of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, by Faith, and not for our own works or deservings. Wherefore, that we are justified by Faith only, is a most wholesome doctrine and very full of comfort.

(b.) "Albeit that Good Works, which are the fruits of Faith, and follow after Justification, can not put away our sins, and endure the severity of God's judgment; yet are they pleasing and acceptable to God in Christ, and do spring out necessarily of a true and lively faith; insomuch that by them a living faith may be as evidently known, as a tree discerned by its fruit.

(c.) "Works done before the grace of Christ, and the Inspiration of his Spirit, are not pleasant to God, forasmuch as they spring not of faith in Jesus Christ; neither do they make men meet to receive grace, or (as the School-authors say) deserve grace of congruity: yea rather, for that they are not done as God hath willed and commanded them to be done, we doubt not but they have the nature of sin."

The early writers of the Reformation, in agreement with each of these last cited paragraphs, considered that to make good works of any degree a part of justification, was to give them the power of satisfying, in part, the Divine justice. Thus Richard Hooker: "He which giveth unto any good works of ours the force of satisfying the wrath of God for sin, the power of meriting either earthly or heavenly rewards; he which

holdeth works going before our vocation, in congruity to merit our vocation; works following our first to merit our second justification, and by condignity, our last reward in the kingdom of heaven, pulleth up the doctrine of faith by the roots."<sup>1</sup>

The carefulness used in drawing these statements is apparent. They were designed to preclude mistakes in practice as well as in theory. The distinctions above made between justification and sanctification, affect directly the estimate which we shall hold of the evil of sin. We have seen that the justifying act of God points immediately to the expiatory sacrifice of Christ as the ground upon which human guilt is pardoned; whereas the sanctifying work within us points to the Holy Spirit as its agent in freeing the soul from its remaining corruption. Now, the evil of sin is most vividly seen in view of its guilt, not of its corrupting power. That, then, is most fitted to deepen in our souls a sense of condemnation for sin, which charges home upon us the criminality of sin as an individual thing, rather than reminds us of the pollutions with which it has befouled humanity. But the place of all others where to see the criminal nature of sin is the cross of Christ. Looking upon him whom his iniquities are there piercing, the sinner gets his truest estimate of the enormity of being a sinner. The anguish, in which the dying Son of God completed his satisfaction to the law and justice of God for human rebellion, is the grand illustration and demonstration of the inconceivable turpitude of man's wickedness as crime perpetrated against heaven's holy government. That atonement, as a vicarious sacrifice in fact as well as in name, for mankind, must therefore be kept close to the mental eye, if sin is to be made to be "exceeding sinful." The doctrine of justification, if purely held, does this. It confines the attention to the offering "finished" on Calvary, of the Lamb of God for the sin of the world. It speaks of guilt, of crime, of condemnation, and of the pardon and removal of these for a sufficient cause—the righteousness and blood of Jesus Christ our Lord, without the reckoning in of any germ of holiness now springing in the heart, under Divine influence. Hence the fact which is not to be challenged, that the heaviest stress which is laid upon the sinfulness of man, the deepest

<sup>1</sup> Hooker's Works; Keble's Ed. Sermon II. § 32. Vol. II., 320.

views, and the sorest experience of its ill-desert, are to be found among those Christians who have held the strictest doctrine of a propitiatory atonement, and of the personal and complete justification of the penitent sinner who believes in Jesus.

Just as this position is left, a lessening off of this estimate of man's criminality for sin is disclosed. As sanctification is stretched over to take in justification as its incipient stage, and thus as forming a part of the ground of justification, and the eye is confused between the work of Christ in justifying, and of the Holy Spirit in cleansing the soul, the sharpness of its sense of guilt is dulled. This tendency is seen in the perfectionists of the day, with whom God's commandment is no longer so "exceeding broad," but that they can very easily compress it within the limits of their obedience. The enormity of sin is so diminished, the guilt and even the pollution of sin are so disguised, the claims of God are so lowered to man's convenience, by these religionists whose peculiar boast it is, that they are pre-eminently "the temples of the Holy Ghost," that they doubtless very sincerely think themselves to be keeping entirely Christ's two commandments, while it is often quite manifest that the *second* one, at least, needs to be much more carefully looked after.

We do not think that the importance can be exaggerated of preserving the utmost distinctness of doctrinal statement, and of the real differences between related doctrines. "When," writes Professor Shedd, "the popular feeling of a period is becoming less correct and healthy, nothing in the way of means does so much towards a change and restoration, as strict accuracy, which is the same as strict orthodoxy, in the popular creed."<sup>1</sup> The historical illustration which this author gives, upon the same page, of the reverse of this unquestionable truth, is impressive; it is almost appalling. "Perhaps, if the feeling of guilt in Augustine's mind had been as poignant and penal as it was in Luther's, or if his eye had been as penetrating and judicial upon this single topic, as was that of Calvin; perhaps, if this great theologian of the Patristic period had been as thorough and profound upon this side of the subject of sin,

<sup>1</sup> History of Christian Doctrine. Vol. II. p. 268.

as he was upon the other, a statement of the doctrine of justification by faith without works might have been originated in the fifth century, that by the blessing of God would have prevented the Papacy, and precluded those ten centuries of 'voluntary humility,' worshipping of saints, and justification by works." For that apostasy came in, as the church well knows, through the dogma, that the efforts of men to become holy may do something to expiate the sin from which they are toiling for release; that is, that sanctification, which is a blended divine and human work, in part saves us, instead of Christ alone. "A keener vision, that could see the distinction between the guilt of sin and its pollution, would not have confounded the work of the Sanctifier with that of the Atoner."

---

## ARTICLE II.

### THE PIETISTS OF GERMANY.<sup>1</sup>

THE Reformation of the sixteenth century was one of those great and surprising events, which attract the notice of succeeding generations, and mark the periods in which they occur as epochs in the history of the world. It sundered the chains of debasing ignorance, and inveterate superstition. It broke the yoke of the most grinding moral and spiritual despotism. It unlocked the long sealed fountains of knowledge, and gave the Bible to the nations. In the course of a few years, it enlightened and emancipated half Europe.

In accomplishing this great work, human instrumentalities were, of course, employed; earnest, appropriate instrumentalities; but the power was of God. So it was felt to be, by those most deeply engaged in it. So it has been acknowledged to be, by succeeding generations. The reformation from Popery was no other than a great and general revival of true religion.

<sup>1</sup> The materials for the following sketch of the History of Pietism are chiefly taken from a work entitled *Pietas Hallensis*, prepared by the celebrated Prof. Francke of Halle, and published in London in 1705.



The Spirit of God accompanied the preaching of Luther and his associates; followed the reading of the Bible, and other good books; and hundreds and thousands were brought to the knowledge of the truth.

But this great revival, like most others which have been enjoyed on earth, was followed by declension. It was perverted to some extent by fanatical leaders; the reformers fell to disputing among themselves; the devil gained an advantage over them; and the Holy Spirit was grieved away.

The internal state of the Lutheran church was for the most part peaceful, so long as the great Reformer lived. His authority was sufficient to overcome opposition, and those who were unwilling to bow to it, had no alternative but to retire. But after the death of Luther, which took place about the middle of the sixteenth century, the peace of the church was much disturbed. Melanethon, though more than equal to Luther in point of learning, had not his firmness and strength of character, or his influence over the popular mind. For the sake of peace, he was disposed to yield certain points, both to the Catholics and Calvinists, which Luther would have preserved inviolate. Hence arose a bitter controversy between what may be called the strict and the moderate Lutherans, which detracted much from the spiritual life of the church. In the language of a cotemporary, "strifes and contentions, disputes and wranglings, grew to an excessive height, but the plain practice of piety fell to decay."

Then the thirty years' war in Germany produced, through the whole Lutheran church, a great degeneracy of morals, and a general prostration of discipline and order. Good preachers were not to be obtained, and the people were obliged to accept of such as were incompetent and worthless. Many of them were destitute of learning and piety; while those who had learning preached metaphysics and school divinity, rather than the pure Gospel of Christ. Their discourses were filled up with technical terms, distinctions, and subtleties, which the people could not understand, and in which, of course, they felt no interest. They combatted heresies, the very names of which were unknown to their hearers, but said little or nothing to arouse them from the sleep of sin, and bring them to newness of life



and new obedience. Many of the clergy, perhaps the most of them, were confessedly unconverted men; and not only so, they insisted that conversion in the proper sense of the term, was not necessary for a minister of Christ.

It is not to be wondered at, therefore, that in the first part of the seventeenth century, the state of religion among the Lutherans was very low. The lamp of spiritual life, which had burned so brightly a hundred years before, seemed likely to go out in darkness.

Nevertheless, it was not entirely extinguished. There were those who sighed and cried over existing desolations, and who were moved to "lift up their voice like a trumpet, and show to the people their transgressions, and to the house of Jacob their sins." Foremost among these was the Rev. John Arndt, an eminent minister of Christ, and general superintendent of the churches of Luneburg. He was first a physician; but being visited with a dangerous sickness, he made a vow to change his profession to that of divinity, in case he should be restored to health. He wrote many books, the most remarkable of which was his treatise on True Christianity, which has been often translated, and has been the means of salvation to many souls.<sup>1</sup> Its influence in Germany, when first published, was not unlike that of Wilberforce's Practical View in England. It presented Christianity in a new light; not as a mere profession, a form, but as a great and solemn reality, which must be felt in the soul, and exhibited in the life, if men would be saved. On the one hand, it aroused multitudes from the sleep of sin, and put them upon a course of new obedience; while on the other, it excited a torrent of opposition, with the intent, though a vain one, to sweep both the book and its author away.<sup>2</sup> The excellent Dr. Worthington of England calls Arndt another Sal-  
vian,

<sup>1</sup> This work consists of four books. The first, Arndt calls the book of Scripture; the second, the book of Life; the third, the book of Conscience; and the fourth, the book of Nature. The first two books are the most esteemed, and were published, separate from the others, in Boston, in 1809.

<sup>2</sup> Among the opponents of Arndt was Lucius Osiander, a divine of Tübingen, who wrote a book against him in a most satirical style, called Theological Cogitations, of which he is said to have deeply repented, when he came to die.

"Whose business it was to convince men of their unchristian spirits and courses of life, and awaken them to the minding of true Christianity; that so they might not place the kingdom of God in meats and drinks, in mere opinions and outward observances, but might make it their great care to be a people reformed in deed and in truth, to crucify the old man in the affections of their souls, and rise to a new life, the holy and humble life of Christ."

Among the many who were savingly benefitted by the writings of Arndt, was a deacon of the church in Rostock, who, at his death in 1661, left in manuscript a tract, entitled *The Watchman's Voice*, which, ere long, was printed. This tract was the means of first opening the eyes of James Philip Spener, who soon became the leading spirit in this great revival movement. This eminent divine, who has been called not improperly "the Protestant Fenelon," was born in 1625, and acquired much fame as an oriental scholar. He was established in the ministry, successively, at Strasburg, Frankfort, Dresden, and Berlin. While at Frankfort, he published his *Pia Desideria*, *Pious Desires*, in which he set forth the great apostasy of the Lutheran church, with the abuses and corruptions resulting from it, and the remedies which he desired to see applied.<sup>1</sup> He also republished several excellent works of a previous age; as the *Postils of Tauler*, *Theologia Germanica*, and *Thomas à Kempis on the Imitation of Christ*. Later in life, he published sixty-six sermons on regeneration, and an important work on the divinity of Christ.

But it was not by his preaching and publications alone that Spener extended his salutary influence. After his removal to Frankfort, in 1666, he established, in his own house, what he called *Collegia Pietatis*, but which we should call meetings for conference and prayer. This was a new measure, at that time, in Germany, and it awakened a very deep interest. Multitudes flocked to these religious meetings, not only students and people in humble life, but ministers, professors, superintendents and officers of the government. More ample accommodations were provided, and other meetings were established on the same general plan. While many favored the meetings and were sav-

<sup>1</sup> This work was first published as a Preface to Arndt's *Postils*, afterwards it was printed separately, and entitled *Pia Desideria*.

ingly benefitted by them, others bitterly opposed and denounced them. They were said to be disorderly, fanatical, and, in many ways, of dangerous tendency. They were sanctioned, however, by some of the Universities and could not be broken up.

Spener was not contented with laboring only for the spiritual good of his fellow-men. He felt for the sufferings of the sick and the destitute, and, though opposed for a time by the magistrates, he succeeded in getting up a hospital in Frankfort for their relief.

In 1686, Spener was removed from Frankfort to Dresden, and became first court preacher to John George III., the Electoral Prince of Saxony. Here he continued the same course which had been pursued at Frankfort; and in addition to it, he commenced the work of assembling and catechising the children. For this he was censured by some of the nobility, and the University professors, who thought it unbecoming in a man of such great parts and learning, and occupying so high a station, to descend to the work of teaching children. But Spener thought differently. He regarded the youth of his flock as the hope of the church, and the most hopeful subjects of pastoral influence. "Older people," he said, "are for the most part inflexible, and unwilling to forsake their established opinions and practices. My greatest hope is from the children." The children appreciated the attentions of their pastor, and his catechetical exercises were thronged.

Spener had the misfortune, however, to be unpopular with the Prince Elector. He was a great drunkard, besides being addicted to other vices, and the plain dealing of the court preacher was offensive to him. He did not like his sermons; and still less could he endure his private visits, which were all of them of the most serious, searching nature. On one occasion, Spener addressed to him a respectful letter, reproving him for his vicious courses, and earnestly calling him to repentance, which gave great offence.

At the time of Spener's removal from Frankfort to Dresden, he had with him several theological students, among whom were Augustus Herman Francke, John Caspar Schade, and Paul Anthony, who now went to Leipsic, to pursue the study of theology there. In accordance with Spener's instructions,

they established a private meeting for the study of the Scriptures, which they called *Collegium Philobiblicum*. At first, their exercises were chiefly critical. Their method was, for one to read a select portion of the Old Testament in Hebrew, or of the New in Greek, and to expound the same; after which observations exegetical and practical were made by the others. As these meetings came to be known, and others wished to unite with them, they were removed to a larger place, and put under the direction of the Professor Extraordinary of Divinity in the University. The leaders were in correspondence with Dr. Spener, who advised them so to conduct their meetings that they might tend more directly to Christian edification and growth in grace. From this time, many were excited to an earnest love of the Bible, to the diligent study of it, and to a fervent breathing after spiritual life. Their meetings were commenced and closed with prayer; and when the passage for the evening had been expounded, all were at liberty to make suggestions and remarks. As the meetings increased in numbers and popularity, others of the same kind sprang up among the students, by means of which the study of the Scriptures was greatly promoted. Mr. Francke opened one biblical school, and Schade another, and Anthony another, in which the truths of the Gospel were explained and applied.

These exercises necessarily drew away students from the University professors, whose lectures really were of little value. "The candidates for the ministry were bred up to a superficial smattering in divine things, and made little or no progress in true Christian theology. They thought it enough to be able to fill a pulpit handsomely, and so to act the orator as to excite the admiration of a vulgar auditory." Nevertheless, the old professors did not like to lose their scholars, and a violent opposition was raised against the new meetings and measures. The cry of heresy was raised; and because the students of the Bible had become serious and earnest in their religion, and endeavored to walk according to its precepts, they were, in derision, called Pietists. Such was the origin of the name given to them. It was, at first, a term of reproach, but was afterwards retained as one of honor.

Throughout the year 1689, the opposition to proceedings at

Leipsic continued to increase. The pulpits rang with the new sect of the Pietists; the Consistory took the matter up, and directed the University to make inquiry respecting it. From Leipsic the excitement spread through the whole of Saxony, and books were written and published on both sides. In the end the biblical meetings were abolished, and the leaders in the movement were driven from Leipsic.

We next hear of Francke and his associates at Erfurth, having been invited there by Dr. Breithaupt, Superintendent and Professor of Divinity in the University, and soon a great change was wrought in the city. The Pietists not only preached in demonstration of the Spirit and with power, but they undertook the catechising of children and youth, who flocked to them in great numbers. The revival which followed so alarmed the magistrates, the most of whom were Roman Catholics, that they procured a mandate, putting a stop to the new proceedings. Shortly after this, both Dr. Breithaupt and Mr. Francke were under the necessity of leaving Erfurth.

Nevertheless, they were not forsaken. The Lord had a more important field for them than any they had yet occupied. Through the influence of Spener, who was still at Berlin, Dr. Breithaupt was made Professor of Divinity in the newly established University at Halle; Francke was Professor of Oriental languages<sup>1</sup>; and Thomacius, a civilian, by whom the University had been projected, was Professor of Law. Paul Anthony was the Pro-Rector or President of the University; so that the whole establishment was in the hands of the Pietists, and under their influence. Francke was also constituted pastor of Glaucha, a village near Halle, where he subsequently established his Orphan House, and other schools. He first instructed and supported orphans and other destitute children, in his own house, in which he was assisted by benevolent citizens of Halle. But as the number of them increased, he found it necessary to provide more ample accommodations. In 1648 was laid the first stone of the buildings, which now form two rows, eight hundred feet in length. Sums of money poured in to him from all quarters; and frequently, when reduced to the greatest straits, the providence of God, in which he trusted, appeared

<sup>1</sup> Afterwards Professor of Divinity.

for his relief. A distinguished chemist, whom Francke visited and instructed on his death-bed, left him recipes for the compounding of medicines, which yielded him an income of from twenty to thirty thousand dollars a year. By this means he was enabled to prosecute his benevolent undertakings, without asking or receiving aid from the government. Francke's Institute, as it was called, embraced not only an Orphan House, but a system of Latin and Grammar schools, a valuable library, and a printing establishment, from which more than a million copies of the Holy Scriptures have been issued.

Spener, though advanced in age, was still living and laboring at Berlin, and rejoicing in the prosperity and usefulness of his former friends and pupils at Halle. He removed to Berlin in 1691, and died in 1705, "being sweetly translated," as Francke expresses it, "in a chariot of divine love and peace, and leaving his name as a fragrant perfume to posterity."

The interests of the Pietists now centred at Halle, and for the next half century, the new University, with its connected institutions, continued to be a fountain of good influences to Germany, and to the world. Faithful pastors were raised up here, to take the places of the worse than useless ones who had before possessed the land. And not only so, but faithful missionaries were sent forth to distant regions of the earth. As the spirit of religion and of missions is the same, we always expect, when the former is revived, to see the latter revived with it. And so it was in the case before us. In the year 1621, the King of Denmark came in possession of the town of Tranquebar, and a small adjoining territory on the coast of Coromandel, in the East Indies. For almost a hundred years, no attempts had been made to instruct the natives; but in the beginning of the eighteenth century, Frederick IV. of Denmark resolved to establish a mission there, with a view to their conversion.

But where shall he look for missionaries, who are ready and qualified, to go and devote their lives to this perilous undertaking? His own country did not furnish them; nor did England furnish them. The Christians of England were willing to assist the Danes in the support of missionaries; but there seems not to have been piety enough at that time in England, to raise

up a missionary to go forth on a work like this. The only place in the Protestant world to which the King of Denmark could look for missionaries, was the Pietist University of Halle. Wherefore, a request was made to Dr. Francke, that he would recommend two or three from among his pupils, who were qualified to enter upon this important undertaking.

The first missionaries sent forth were Bartholomew Teigenbalg and Henry Phitscho, who sailed from Copenhagen, Nov. 29, 1705. They were followed at short intervals, by such men as Grundler, Schultz, Walther, Fabricius, and more especially Swartz. Swartz arrived in India in the autumn of 1750, and continued his labors there for almost half a century. The fruits of them remain to the present day.

In looking back upon this revival in Germany, we are constrained to regard it as a precious work of God, springing up in a season of deep declension, and shedding anew the blessed influences of the Gospel upon the land of Luther and of the other reformers. In its essential features, it strongly resembled more recent revivals, and especially that which took place in New England, near the middle of the last century. Like that, it came when it was most needed—when the light of life was burning dimly, and the holy example of a previous generation was likely to be lost. Like that, it was destined to encounter, at every step, a violent opposition, springing chiefly from a cold and selfish clergy, whose negligence the example of the revivalists reproved, and whose influence they curtailed. When Whitefield first visited New England, he found ministers not a few, who gave him no evidence of piety, who did not pretend to be regenerated persons, who even insisted that a renewed heart constituted no part of the necessary qualification of a minister of Christ. And just so it was in Germany, in the days of Arndt, and Spener, and Francke, and when told of their delinquencies, and urged to repent, they in both instances raised a storm of opposition, intended either to silence the reformers, or to drive them away. It was the same spirit which our Saviour encountered, in his reproofs of the Jewish scribes and teachers of the law: "Thus saying, Master, thou reproveth us also." In dealing with unworthy pastors, the Pietists of Germany were apparently more cautious and discreet than Whitefield, yet they



did not escape reproach and persecution. They found, as faithful men have ever found, and ever will, that the offence of the cross had not ceased.

Near the close of our Whitefieldian revival, a fanatical spirit began to show itself, which gave occasion to opposition and reproach, and so it was in the time of Luther; and to some extent among the Pietists of Germany. At any rate, we hear such things of them; although the report comes, almost entirely, from those who had no sympathy with them, or their work. The devil knows how to manœuvre at such times. If he can not stop a needed reform, or a revival movement, he can enter into it, and spoil it. If he can not arrest the chariot of salvation, he can mount the driver's box, and seize the reins, and like Jehu of old press on furiously.

The Whitefieldian revival was followed by a long and sad declension, reaching through the French and Revolutionary wars, producing a marked division among the clergy of New England, and issuing in the Unitarian defection of our own times. A similar result issued upon the Pietist revival. Before the close of the last century, an infidel, transcendental, rationalistic movement commenced in Germany, which, in its progress, swept through the churches and universities, and corrupted and ruined the great body of the Lutheran clergy; and what is most of all to be deplored, the noble University of Halle, which was got up by the Pietists, and worked by them, and accomplished, for a time, such a vast amount of good, was the first to be corrupted. Semler, the father of German rationalism, was a graduate of Halle. He commenced his career as a theological teacher there in 1752. He was a man of varied and extensive learning, but employed all his learning to unsettle the faith of his countrymen in the divine authority and inspiration of the Bible and in the most essential religious truths. Nor were his teachings without their legitimate fruits. The moral condition of the students at Halle, and even of the theological students, towards the close of the last century, Tholuck tells us, was deplorable. Those of them who resided in Dr. Semler's house were frequently seen abroad in a state of nudity. Bahrdt, who called himself a theologian, kept a coffee-house of his own, where he received his



boon companions, and where, says Tholuck, "the waiting-maid took the place which belonged to the wife." Bahrdt died in early life of a vile disease, the result of his debaucheries.

We see in instances such as these, proof incontestable not of the bad influence of revivals, but of the inveterate corruption of human nature. Ours is a depraved, ruined world, in which the best things, if left to themselves, are sure to run down and become the worst.

Let us be thankful that a better spirit is now prevailing in Germany; that her churches are recovering from the great gulf of infidelity in which they were so deeply whelmed; and that a large body of her clergy, we hope a majority, are distinguishing themselves, not only for critical biblical learning, but for the inculcation of evangelical truth.

---

### ARTICLE III.

#### THEORIES OF THE WILL.

THE discussion of this subject of the will turns necessarily on points of definition. Correct discriminations help to clear the subject of difficulties. Define the will as Coleridge defined it, to be the moral and mental starting-point in responsibility, and keeping to the definition, you reach a theory of the will corresponding thereto.<sup>1</sup> Define the will as Edwards defined it in his theological writings, as comprehending the entire moral nature of man, the moral sense, the emotions and desires, and you reach a philosophy of the will differing by certain shades from the theory above supposed.<sup>2</sup> Define the will to be the mind's power of decision that follows choice, as some recent writers have done, and the definition will essentially modify the

<sup>1</sup> We derive this definition from the drift of Coleridge's writings, rather than from any definite statements of the author. He followed M. de Biran, Cousin, etc.

<sup>2</sup> President Edwards seems to have adopted a theory of the will in his ethical writings widely different from the one he combatted in his memorable *Treatise on the Will*.

ethical system founded upon it.<sup>1</sup> But define the will as modern writers and schools have defined it, with few exceptions, as the mind's power to choose and resolve, and you have a philosophy of the will agreeing with systems or theories founded upon different definitions, in scarcely a single point.

We lay the theory of Coleridge, of Edwards, of Hodge and others, out of the question for the present, and proceed to consider questions of the will according to the theory now generally adopted, as being the mind's power to choose and resolve, in the sense of carrying its choices into effect.

If it be asked what is the will in its ultimate principle, or in the simplest idea of it, we answer, it is the mind willing, in the sense of choosing and resolving, just as the affections are the mind feeling, and the conscience the mind-perceiving intuitively the right or wrong. The will, then, is the mind's power of making choices and coming to decisions in the presence of motives or that which challenges choice, or tends to this result.

The mind is not to be set off into parts or powers as the checker-board is into squares and colors, or the map into countries and sections. It is so constituted that it has the power to act, now in this way or style, and now in some other way or style; but it is the same intelligent, sentient substance that acts in these different ways. It is the mind, one and the same, that originates, reasons, recalls, feels, resents and resolves. It is the same essence or unit that acts in these diversities of operations.<sup>2</sup>

The powers that can thus act diversely are styled functions of the mind. The mind as such may act in different ways and come into different consciousnesses, so to express it, but it can not rationally act in conflict with itself. Each of its powers has laws and limitations; so the soul as such becomes a self-contained, self-moved, self-regulated unit, never in disorder or derangement save as the laws by which it was made to be governed are violated.

<sup>1</sup> See Hazzard, Hodge, and others.

<sup>2</sup> An eminent writer has said, "The mind bears different names according to the nature of its operations. Inasmuch as it contemplates, it is spirit, *spiritus*. Inasmuch as it comprehends, it is reason, *ratio*. Inasmuch as it recollects, it is memory, *memoria*. Inasmuch as it feels, it is sentiment, *sensus*. Inasmuch as it resolves, it is will, *voluntas*. But these are not divisions in its substance. The one soul acts in these different ways." Alcuin, teacher and adviser of Charlemagne.

In this paper we shall briefly consider the will as the mind's power to choose and resolve in the sense of giving its choices practical effect.

It is natural to raise the question, has the will of itself a self-determining power? Has it the power of contrary choice? Is it capable of acting according to the weaker motive, or contrary to the greatest apparent good? We assume, if the will has either of these attributes or facilities, it has all of them; if it lacks either of them, it lacks all of them. They involve the same principles, and call into exercise the same elements of power and independence.

Let us, first, consider the power of self-determination as claimed for the will. If it exists at all, it must needs be a capacity in the will of acting independently of the other powers of the mind. It supposes a voluntary energy that could dispense with the conclusions of reason and the force of the affections in choice. It is claimed to be a *self*-determining power. It is alleged that the will acts, or has the power to act, from the force of its own inherent energies, and independently of any central law of the mind. We take this to be the theory asserted.<sup>1</sup>

Now the will, we have said, is distinct from the other faculties of the soul. It is the mind's power of acting in a specific way, namely, of making choices, forming decisions and carrying them into action. But the will, we affirm, can not act of itself, independently of the other faculties of the mind. It can not separate itself in its functions from the activity of the intellect and feelings. Difference here does not imply independence; nor does distinctness of activity imply independence. The will as a mental force has its own laws and ways; but it is not one of them to act independently of the other powers of the mind. It can not ignore them in its choices and resolutions. It has the condition of its activity, the ground of its choices, the data of its determinations in these authoritative powers of the mind. The intellectual operations and moral impulses enter into the account of the voluntary activity as an indispensable and enabling cause. The mental and moral processes and discriminations have to do naturally and necessarily with the laws that

<sup>1</sup> The will has power over its own determinations. Reid, also Hamilton.

regulate the will. They are forces concerned in its decisions; they are conditions pre-requisite to its action in any rational way. The will can not say to the intellect: I have no need of thee; nor to the conscience or the heart, I have no need of thee. It can not dispense with the light and laws that come to it from the sovereignty of the mind and heart in its operations. It can not but feel the force of the mental discriminations and moral affections in its decisions. The sovereignty of the mind is in these; while its executive efficiency is in the will. They are the sources of all legitimate and binding responsibility. If the will was in any proper sense independent of the intellectual and sentient nature, it would be a false guide in moral agency. If it could shut out the light that comes to it from the understanding and the conscience; or shut off the force of the sympathies and affections by any self-regulating activity of its own, it were a dangerous element in the soul. Who would feel safe for a moment with any such power between the moral nature and responsible activity? The will stands between the man and his actions. It connects man with his conduct. It is the last link in the chain of moral agency. It represents the mind at the bar of responsibility. It identifies the moral nature with moral agency and human behavior. It is the efficiency, not only, but the representative of the soul. It can not disconnect itself, therefore, from the rational and sentient nature; but connects these, at once, with personal activity and responsibility. If the will could resolve itself into a condition of positive independence of the mind—its laws and powers, of what worth would it be in responsibility? What sort of authority would attach to its determinations? What shade of character would there be in them? What element of responsibility could be gotten out of them, or into them?

We desire to be explicit upon this matter of the alleged independence of the will. We said that, in the simplest idea of it, the will is the mind willing, or putting forth choices and decisions. How, then, can it be independent of the reason when it is the mind's own act in the form of volition? The affections are defined to be the mind feeling. Now we ask, how can the affections separate themselves from corresponding activity of the intellect? Can the heart be moved to sensibility

till the intellect has brought before it objects fitted to awaken sensibility? What more preposterous than to set up for exclusive and independent activity on the part of the affections; in other words, for the self-determining power of the heart? The same, too, of the conscience; which is the mind, discriminating in view of moral relations adapted to awaken the idea of right and obligation. But can the conscience act independently of the reason or understanding that presents these relations to the moral sense? Can it be claimed for the conscience that it has any thing like the self-determining power? Can it be claimed for either of the faculties of the mind, having susceptibilities of separate and different activities, that they are, in any proper sense, independent of each other? No one power of the mind can act independently of other powers. The action of the reason, affections and will is correlative action. Hence the determinations of the will, if proper and reliable, are to be referred to the conclusions of the reason and promptings of the affections. It can not rationally separate itself from these, in its activity. If it could do so, its decisions would be lawless, groundless, reckless. It would not be such a force in responsibility as one would wish to have, or as God in his benevolence could give. It would be no guide in personal accountability; it would be an unsafe element in moral agency. Its action would chance to be irregular, contingent, haphazard. No, the will can no more separate itself from the affections and moral sense in its activity, than these can separate themselves from the understanding. As well claim that the affections, or the fears, or the conscience, are self-moved and independent, as that the will is so. If the affections were to ignore the light of the intellect, and the conscience to shut its eye to the moral relations unfolded by reason, what reliance could be placed on them in moral responsibility? The mind, in that case, were as well off without these faculties or functions as with them, as to any proper harmony in itself, or any right moral ends. Why, then, should we assume to give to the will a liberty which could not be given to the other powers of the mind? What sort of necessity that we do this? What safety would there be in its decisions, if it were to act independently of the general government and harmony of the mind?

The will, then, has need to go out of itself to get proper grounds or data for its action. As with the other powers, so with this, its action is a related action, a dependent and in some sense, mutual action. Its choices, if rational, result from proper discriminations and proper affections; else they would be unfit representatives of the moral nature, and would form a treacherous ground of moral obligation. The will can not set up a court of its own in the soul, as a sort of star-chamber, without presumption. It would cease thus to express properly the mental and moral operations. It would cease to indicate obligation to activity, or to connect the moral nature with personal conduct. It would not be a true index of the soul; and could not properly determine or indicate accountability.

Such is not the nature of the will. It has not the power of self-determination. It can not assume any thing like vicegerency in the soul without usurpation. In such case, its action would be irrelevant, abnormal, irresponsible, blind. Moved by no ray of reason, no rule of conscience, no force of affection, it would be a demoralizing element of activity within, and would turn the whole rational scene into confusion and chaos.

We then dismiss this claim for the will, as founded on no mental analogy, demanded by no moral principle, favored by no rational experience, and made necessary by no moral exigency. No such power exists in the moral constitution of man. No such right of secession or independence inheres in the government of the mind. The claim, therefore, is not allowed.

What then, secondly, becomes of the theory of contrary choice, as claimed for the will? This doctrine of contrary choice follows from the theory of self-determination as a logical sequence. It goes to the ground if that theory fails. The power of contrary choice has no possible basis save in the absolute independence of the will or voluntary nature.

What is this doctrine of contrary choice? It assumes that the will can create or reverse its own decisions of itself, independently of the other faculties of the mind.<sup>1</sup> It assumes that the will can come to a choice the opposite of the one actually made,

<sup>1</sup> In the will there is an alternative power, or pluri-efficient power. Whedon on the Will.

and this by virtue of its own self-determining power. It can do this without any regulating process of the higher moral faculties of the soul. It can do this without any change in the mental or moral status of the one choosing. It can elect with or without reasons, or contrary to them. It can choose according to motives, or contrary to them; according to supposed interests and rational considerations, or against them. It can make choices alternately that clash with each other, and without any change, moral or mental, in the one choosing. It can adopt the alternate or opposite choice with the same readiness and facility that it did the one it actually made. It can choose either way, any way, or no way, at its own option, and by virtue of its own inherent independence. So we are taught to believe.<sup>1</sup>

There is then in the will a sort of sovereignty or absoluteness that fits it, as is claimed, for the special exigencies of responsibility. It can ignore the authority of reason and the moral nature. It can reverse motives at option, and veto the laws of judgment and rational decision according to its own caprices. It can always decide otherwise than it does, and without any change whatsoever in the circumstances or moral condition of the agent.

Now we deny that the will has of itself as a function of the mind any such power. We said the will is the mind choosing and determining. We would have more properly said, it is the mind and heart, the rational and moral nature, acting thus. It can not, therefore, dispense with the laws that govern rational action. It can not swing loose from the reason and the affections in the process of coming to a decision. No one power of the mind has any such independence or separateness from the other powers of the mind, much less the will that represents the rational and moral nature in responsibility. It would imply one of two things, either that the will has some element of reason and affection of its own distinct from the natural reason and affection, or else it has power to act without any reason or

<sup>1</sup> Prof H. P. Tappan says in his review of Edwards on the Will, (we quote the substance of his statements): The will can take the side of the reason against the sensibilities, or of the sensibilities against the reason, or it can take sides against them both. President Mahan takes the same ground, and others of greater or less note.



affection whatsoever. If the will has not reason and sensibility of its own, and if it is capable of acting independently of the natural reason and sensibility, it must needs have power to act without any such regulating influence or motive as these, in the crisis of decision.

But we ask, has the will anything like intellect or sensibility of its own apart from the higher reason and sensibility? If so, what of the will's reason and affection? What relation do they hold to the natural reason and affection? And in what sense do they differ? And then, it would be obvious to ask: What were the use of such duplicate endowments? What need of a two-fold reason, one of the mind, and the other of the will; or of complex sensibilities, one class belonging to the mind, and the other to the will; or of a confused conscience, one sort in the service of the mental, and the other, of the voluntary nature? .. The supposition would involve singular mental phenomena, and would necessitate a somewhat crude and crooked mental philosophy. The theorist will then be forced to take the other point of the dilemma, namely, that the will must have power to act without any reason or affection or moral influence whatsoever. For if it does not possess these of itself, and can act independently of them in their natural sphere in the mind, it must be able to act without them in any and every sense.

We are forced to set such a theory, involving a dilemma, either point of which is so irrational and unnatural, out of the question at once. Have we need to combat a theory that assumes the possibility of a divorce of the rational from the voluntary nature, that makes the latter independent of the former, that separates the will from the reason and the moral nature, in its choices? But the theory in question does this. Certainly, if the will has not these as an endowment of its own, and has power to act independently of them in their natural relations to the soul, it must needs have power to act without them in any form or sense conceivable; that is to say, it has power to act arbitrarily, irrationally, contingently.

But as this theory of contrary choice is contended for with great ability and from the highest sources, we will bestow upon it still further attention. What is choice? Answer: The determination of the mind in preferring one thing to another in view



of rational considerations. One comes to a divergence of roads. He pauses, and considers, and determines to take the right rather than the left. That which brought him to this decision was the power of choice, or that element of the will which we denominate as such; and that which brought him to this choice was the supposed reasons in the case. But on the theory of contrary choice, he could as well have chosen the left as the right, and with no change of reasons or motives in the case.

Take a different illustration, where moral character is involved. One is invited to a drinking saloon. An alternative is before him, to remain at home, and enjoy one kind of happiness; or go to the house of dissipation and enjoy another kind of happiness. Either course has its allurements. The charms of vice or the charm of home must prevail. It is the former. He chooses perversely and goes the way of death.

The question narrows itself down to this: Had that man power to do otherwise than he did? In this form of the question we answer affirmatively. He had the power of reflection, of counting the cost and the consequences. His soul is a harp of many strings, every one of which is sensitive to each breath of influence, and every chord in this divine instrument touches, terminates in the will.

But the exact question here is, has the will alone, of itself, acting independently of the moral nature, or vibratory action of the sensitive spirit within, any power to act otherwise in the circumstances than it did act? We admit that the soul with its furniture of faculties, its complete equipment for moral agency, has this power. It belongs to the soul comprehensively, but not to any particular function of the soul. The theorist on the other hand, endows the will with a sort of a sovereignty over the soul in moral action. It is self-determinating, he tells you. It has no need to await the tardy action of reason and sensibility in moral emergencies, but can seize the reins of responsibility, and act authoritatively, independently, absolutely, and at once.

But we may be told here, in the way of a compromise of opinions, that this power of contrary choice is of the nature of a special endowment of the will, and would need be used only in extraordinary exigencies, that the will in ordinary affairs is, indeed, regulated by the reason and moral nature. Something

like a latent force, or reserved power, we will suppose to be claimed for the will here, in the use of which it can seize the helm of the mind, and put the ship of responsibility against wind and tide and sea by its own strong right arm. It is in the use of this special power, therefore, reserved for unwonted occasions, that the will can set aside the authority of reason and motive and assume the sovereignty within.

But we do not see that this helps the case at all. If the will has this power at all, it would be natural to use it at its own option, and we do not see by what law it would be limited to special occasions. And then, if it be in the greater matters of responsibility that this power of absolute independence is to be used, the difficulty and danger still exist in all their strength. We say danger, for if the will has power to choose contrary to choice, to prefer against preference, to decide against decision, and determine against determination; if it can refuse what on the whole it prefers, and can choose what is not actually desired, and this with no change whatsoever in the scale of appreciable motive or of moral considerations, what safety is there in human responsibility? What guarantee has conscience or virtue or character? We ask, again, in order to be perfectly explicit upon this point: Can one prefer a thing exactly the opposite of the one he desires, and with no change whatever in the circumstances or moral conditions in the case? Can he do so by the will alone? Can the will regulate its own choices of itself absolutely? Can it arbitrate in the crisis of decision without reference to reason or conscience or the moral nature? We want to ask precisely this: Can one choose a course, or a thing, and at the same instant, have the power to choose oppositely, or adversely to the choice made? The doctrine of contrary choice teaches that one can choose as he does, or as he does not; what he desires, or does not desire; and this, by the force of the self-determining power of the will. The will of itself effects or accomplishes this alternateness of decision! Choices are mere playthings of the will, it would seem. It can create them, and annihilate them, at its own option. It can veto its own determinations continuing such, we are told. For if they have ceased to be choices by the quick intervention of reason or the arbitration of the higher moral powers, the question is changed,

the theory falls to the ground; no room is left for doubt or controversy. But the doctrine or theory supposes an existing choice, an alternate or opposite one to the prevalent choice, that so suddenly supercedes and vanquishes the other.<sup>1</sup> Now it is admitted that this may be so, where there are reasons or causes of the nature of motives, summoned to the bar of the will by the higher nature. But all such processes our theory excludes. It makes the will all-sufficient in the case, yea, self-sufficient. It gives us an effect without reasons. It gives us action with no rational ground of action. It gives the will a veto power upon the choices and decisions remaining such, and a creative power to originate new ones out of nothing, that antagonize against those vetoed. The choices are called up, and put down; are made to come forth, and disappear, as mere automats of the will. And motives, if allowed any weight at all, can be made to change places instantly by this innate sovereignty residing in the voluntary nature.<sup>2</sup>

It is fair to state here, that the theory now in hand is put forth no doubt as a supposed necessity to save the doctrine of moral agency. It is urged in the interests of moral freedom, and to give just ground for human responsibility. The will must be free, it is said, or man is not responsible. But this does not follow, if we are to attach to the doctrine of freedom such notions as we have just considered, and as are strenuously taught. The statement is very sophistical and unsatisfactory. The truth is here: The soul must be free, or man is not accountable. The spirit as a unit has this attribute. We say, then, that the soul of man is, in the proper sense of the word, free.

<sup>1</sup> "The will has unrestricted power to put forth a counter volition in the same unchanged circumstances. Whedon."

<sup>2</sup> It may be objected that the will must have power to act in cases where there can be no preference or choice whatever; as when either of two things, equal in amount and quality is offered; or when two roads are before you with no appreciable reason for taking the one rather than the other; or when two courses of conduct present themselves, with an apparent balance of motives or reasons for taking either. But in cases like these the choice is not between the things presented, but between acting and not acting in the case; or between taking one, without care as to which, or neither of them. Such suppositions give no strength whatever to the theory in question. We would say generally that to be without choice in a moral exigency, if the thing were supposable, would be of itself a sin.

But soul and will are not identical. The words are not synonyms.<sup>1</sup>

The will is a function of the soul, but not the soul itself. It shares in moral responsibility, but does not monopolize it. It has the reactive, as well as the recipient capability. It has its portion of endowments belonging to moral agency, the other faculties have their portion also. It has its place and play on the moral scene; the other powers have theirs too. The sovereignty is federal, and not sectional. In order to the proper freedom of the will, it has no need to be independent of the other powers of the mind. Such independence were destructive of true freedom. It were as the arm taken from the body; or the eye unorbited from its sphere. The will is free in the freedom of the other powers, but is not free from them. We might as well have no freedom at all, as one into which no element of reason or responsibility enters. It were an aimless, useless, worthless freedom, unhinged from moral relations, or moral restraint. Such liberty would be of the nature of licentiousness and utter recklessness. Divorce the will from the moral nature, that it may be free, and man accountable! If man had such a will, he would not be free nor accountable; he would not be rational; or could not, indeed, act rationally. Such divorce were enthrallment, it were derangement. Who would trust for a moment the caprices of a mental force that could ignore all the rules of reason and moral restraint? Such freedom of the will would overthrow the freedom of the soul. It would be but another name for bondage or despotism. So far from being an element of liberty in man in the interests of moral agency, and just accountability, it would effect the overthrow of all true liberty of the soul. It were liberty in particular, for thralldom in general. Such freedom were had at too dear a rate. It would be a sort of secession from the government within. It would do the work of ruin in the moral nature. This power to lead off in responsibility, it may be against the remonstrances of reason and the moral sense, would reduce the soul to a state of chaos and anarchy. Is it

<sup>1</sup> We use the terms soul and spirit to mean the same, though not unaware that in systems of moral philosophy, a distinction is made. We mean by soul, the whole spiritual nature of man.

said, this would not follow? But forces are likely to assert themselves; endowments rarely lie dormant; faculties are for use; power for evil is a fearful thing in perverse nature.

We would say once more, the rational and moral powers have need to express themselves through the will in order to proper accountability. How else are the results of reason and the moral nature to indicate the character at the bar of responsibility? If the will can veto these, or contravene their verdict or promptings in the crisis of action, what confidence can be placed in its decisions? In what sense does it represent the mind and the heart? But what other representative has the mind and heart on the scene of responsibility? If the will does not represent them, they have no way of expressing themselves in the crisis of action. They are without a representative in the court of responsibility.

We now proceed to the third point raised in the discussion. Has the will the power to act contrary to the greatest apparent good, or under the influence of the weaker motive?

Motive is that which induces choice and decision, or tends to this. It is objective and subjective; from without and from within. There must needs be something *ab extra*, that appeals to the desires and tastes within, to induce choice and action; so there must needs be that within also, in the form of inclination or susceptibility, to which the outward object appeals. The outward object is called a motive, the inward affection is called a motive. Neither of them would be a motive without the other; it takes both the outward and inward motive to fulfil the condition necessary to action. In the apostasy the apple was the objective motive, the appetite or aspiration the subjective. In state, the honor or crown is the objective motive, restless ambition is the inward or subjective motive. The outward object or motive must needs take on the complexion or coloring of the inward affection, so to speak, in order to influence the conduct. Our responsibility has to do with subjective motives, that have their sphere in the soul. We are not accountable for that which appeals to us from without. But we are always accountable for the response which the outward solicitation awakens within. And then we are to consider motives with regard to their intrinsic weight or value, in opposition to their

apparent or seeming power. In other words, motives are to be considered in view of their intrinsic character; and also in view of their actual or effective influence. God regards motives intrinsically; man regards them as they seem to him. God looks upon them as they are; man as they appear. A motive may be strong as intrinsically viewed, that is powerless in view of the one acting. A motive may be powerful as regarded from a grovelling standpoint, that would seem weak and worthless from the standpoint of high moral principle. The same thing viewed by the holy and the unholy has an opposite tendency, and is an opposite motive.

Now if the question be, whether one can act according to the weaker motive intrinsically viewed, or not, it is easily answered. We would say, man ordinarily acts thus, till he comes to act from principle. The weaker motive properly viewed offers to the depraved man the greater seeming good, while the stronger motive intrinsically regarded offers to such the least apparent good. When the sinful man acts according to the greatest apparent good, and under the influence of that which is to him the stronger motive, he acts contrary to the greatest real good, and according to the weaker motive, as regarded by the pure and the holy. That which seems the stronger motive is really the weaker motive; and that which seems to such the greatest good, is, in fact, no good at all, but a positive evil.

So the question is not, whether the will can decide contrary to the greatest real good, or the stronger motive intrinsically viewed. There is no doubt here. It is the way, the habit of a perverse will to act thus. It ordinarily does this, till it comes into harmony with moral law. But the question is this; whether the will can of itself, independently of the other powers, choose contrary to the greatest seeming good, or the stronger motive as viewed by the one choosing. Let us examine this matter for a moment.

Choice implies comparison, which calls into action the intellect and desires. We can not conceive of an act of choice where there has not been this process of comparison, and also the stirrings of desire in the heart. Now in what sense can a thing be said to be chosen, which has, in the view of the understanding, and in the scale of the affections, fewer points of at-

traction and desirableness, than the thing rejected? We would ask the same with respect to different courses of conduct to be decided upon by the will. How can a motive be said to preponderate in decision which had, on the whole, in view of the person, fewer attractions and less influence than the one set aside? In other words, how can one prefer a lesser good to a greater, himself being judge in the case? How can one prefer a thing, or a course, that offers him less happiness than the one rejected? Why prefer it, if it be a lesser good in his own esteem, and when the other and greater good was equally attainable? We ask how this can be at the time of the choice, without change in the one choosing, and as a pure act of the will itself. When one makes a choice, can it be said that the considerations that brought him to the decision were literally weaker in his view than those that failed to do it? Did he act as if it was so? Did he feel that it was so? Was it so? Then why the choice in the case? Indeed, was it a choice at all? Let the advocates of the theory answer.

We would add, if the will has the power claimed above, to act against preponderating motives and moral considerations, and this without change in the thoughts or heart, it has power to dispense with motives altogether external to itself. If it can act against them, it can act without them. If it can act in spite of motives to the contrary, it can act when free from them.<sup>1</sup> Motives in such case were an encumbrance or embarrassment in the act of choice; so that advantage would be gained to the will in point of freedom, if they were taken away. If the will can choose what it does not want, and set aside what it does want, it is done by virtue of a power to dispense with motives altogether. It can laugh at reasons; spurn inducements, and set up for itself in responsibility; and do this lawlessly, absolutely, recklessly. If one can choose that which seems to him less desirable than that which he rejects, or has power to set at nought a greater seeming good and adopt the lesser one in its place, he must have power to act independently of motives, and in the absence of them. The will were as a wheel within a wheel, running lawlessly in the general movement, and to the destruction of the

<sup>1</sup> "Is volition dependent on motive?" Prof. F. H. Newhall.



general harmony. It would be a dangerous force in responsibility, leading to irregularity and absurdity in action, and would be subversive of all moral ends.

As we have said, the above theories have been adopted, no doubt, in the interests of moral freedom, and to avoid the hand of iron fatalism. Good men have supposed that the doctrine of moral agency necessitated the hypothesis above considered; and rather than give up this doctrine, they have started theories that necessarily overthrow it. Relief here is not found in the will as a will, but in the soul as a moral unit. It is not found in a fraction of the soul, but in the unity and harmony of the soul.<sup>1</sup> We admit the sovereignty of the soul as a whole in a proper dependence on divine power, in every exigency of human life. In such dependence rightly exercised, the soul, not the will, has the self-determining power, the power of contrary choice, and to arbitrate in the presence of motives. We do not object to the statement that the will has this power, if you connect it rightly with the soul, and make it the proper expression or representative of the soul, if it be regarded, in other words, as the sensorium, or focal point of the spiritual nature. The soul thus considered and regulated has a sovereignty over motives, external and internal; it can regulate and control them and arbitrate between them; it can adjust itself to exigencies instantly; it can make the weak motive strong, or the strong one weak. With its full furniture of faculties, it is sensitive to every moral influence and inducement and interest; it can summon from all sources and worlds considerations to act upon the will and induce a rational decision. We are not shut up to a single faculty or force in the great affairs of moral agency. That agency calls into play a moral system, an order of faculties, mutual and harmonious, in the proper use of which the great ends of life are reached. The will has its play in these, but can not act independently of them, much less can it monopolize the moral sense; it does not control the moral faculties; it is not absolute in moral agency; it in-

<sup>1</sup> "The moral ideas that are given by reason, in the light of which we choose and act, through which indeed the will is a rational rather than a brute will, are quite as necessary to personality as the power of choosing and acting." *President Hopkins' Lectures on Moral Philosophy.*



dicates, expresses, represents, and connects the moral powers with the conduct in responsible action; it has freedom in their play, but in not playing free from them; its freedom is one of harmony rather than of independence. Moral freedom is not in the reason, nor the conscience, nor the affections, nor the will alone; but in their synthesis or harmony. Free agency, therefore, is not of the voluntary nature as distinct from the moral; but it is in and from them both. Freedom, it is true, is essential to just accountability; but it is not the will's freedom or independence of the rational and moral nature. These constitute accountability. The will is free, not from the soul, but in the soul; not of the moral nature, but as its exponent. It has no independence of its own that frees it from rational distinction or moral restraint. It is a symptom of insanity when the will obeys no law of wisdom or reason. But man is so endowed that he can summon considerations instantaneously to influence his conduct through the will and thus regulate the choices so as to conform to moral law. On this ground moral freedom is safe, and no place is left for necessity or fatalism. The power of contrary choice and of regulating the motives, the soul of man certainly has. It belongs to the moral nature as a whole, but not to the voluntary nature in particular. This attribute of freedom in the soul, properly distributed among the powers, holds the key to accountability. How different this from the freedom claimed for the will exclusively, that gives it independence of the rational and moral faculties! Such freedom would destroy moral liberty in its largest sense. It would be of the nature of "State rights," as absorbing the general sovereignty. It would be liberty for a part, but slavery in general.

But the view we have taken relieves this question of responsibility entirely. It puts the attribute of liberty where it belongs. For what though the will has not independence, if the soul in its completeness has it? What though the will as such has not authority or power against prevailing motives, if the soul itself possesses a mastery over them; can recall, create or regulate them according to a felt sense of their weight, and the force of obligation in the case? Is not the freedom here claimed for the will a broader and better freedom, more natural and relia-

ble than could be had by any assumed sovereignty or independence of its own? The will has just this freedom, not of itself apart from the moral constitution, but as growing out of it, and acting in accordance with it. The will is free only as the soul is free. It is free because the soul is free. The soul can not be in bondage, and its functions or powers be free. The will is in some sort the instrument of the soul, the short arm of the mighty lever, acted upon by the controlling powers of the mind.

Thus furnished the soul has the attributes of perfect moral agency. It can summon considerations that lead to rational conclusions instantaneously, or can banish them as soon if seen to be faulty. Is it said that the will does this? How does it do it, and why? Independently of the soul, or as its representative, its efficiency? The moral man, thus endowed, can trample temptation in the dust, and by the force of reasons and motives adapted to do this. Moral freedom, like moral agency, has a broad basis, and a wide field. These come of the completeness of the moral furnishing or the endowment of the soul as a whole. The soul has no bondage save that which is self-imposed or freely allowed. Responsibility rests here, is reasonable; and retribution or accountability following is just.

The bearing of this discussion upon questions of Christian doctrine is plain. We will notice in particular its relation to the question of sin, as to whether it is limited to the will, or affects the whole moral being. It would seem that limiting it to the will merely is to take an inadequate view if it. The theory is contradicted, we think, by a correct philosophy, and the plain teachings of the Bible. Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts, adultery, fornication, murder, theft, etc. Can we limit the motions of sin or evil to that which is but an expression or exponent of the moral being? Are we to look for sin in that which follows the affections, rather than in the heart itself? Is there not somewhat in us that is not expressed through the will to any positive result? The heart's choices are not always the actual decisions. Man is often prepared morally for much that he does not dare to do practically. The surface volition or snatch resolve does not always represent the deep moral character.

We are restrained from much evil doing and purposing by our surroundings and our fears.

To limit human sinfulness, therefore, to the voluntary nature, is to fail to get the full inventory of it. Sin is a deeper thing; its roots run below the purposes or choices. It has its seat and reign in the moral nature.

It needs scarcely be said here that taking the broader definition of the will, as embracing the whole moral nature, as in Edwards on the Affections, or as the active responsible agent, according to Coleridge, it would follow that all sin is of the will. Hence, those adopting these definitions affirm this, and do it consistently with themselves and with the truth.<sup>1</sup> With the most thorough views of the sinfulness of man, they say nevertheless, all sin is of the will, meaning here that it lies in its death-forms in the deep moral nature of man. But, to express this truth, they use the same terms that those use who hold different opinions of the nature and guilt of sin. Both schools in philosophy and theology hold that all sin is of the will; the one meaning by the will a part, the other the whole of the moral man.

With great respect for those who differ from us, we are brought to the conclusion that whatever philosophy of the will we adopt, whether we make it a function of the soul, as in this paper, or the substance or foundation of the soul, with Coleridge and others, we shall be brought to the result that human sinfulness and responsibility extend to the deep moral nature of man. This nature is the man himself morally. No part of the moral being is exempt from the claims of God, or the scrutiny of the last judgment.

It belongs to this discussion properly, to notice the relations of the will to the subject of ability, and inability, to questions of regeneration and the Spirit's influence. It reaches questions also that relate to responsibility under moral government and the sovereignty of God. It enters into the whole subject of practical religion, as well as of Christian theology. But we will not pursue the subject farther. These relations will be suggested to the reader without argument.

<sup>1</sup> See article on Imputation in this *Review* for April, 1867.

## ARTICLE IV.

## PREACHING FROM WITHIN.

IN an interesting book, which we have recently been perusing, entitled, "*My Ministerial Experiences*," written by a pious German pastor, this passage is found :

"If we distinguish among poets between those who make verses and those in whom verses are born, we may with equal justice distinguish between those sermons written according to rule and with infinite trouble, and those that gush forth from the preacher's inner life. All preaching springs from the word of God, and nothing more is necessary than to live upon the Gospel. It is essential that the preacher should place himself under the power of the text and with prayer and self-examination seek to discover how it applies to himself; what reproof and consolation, what warning and nourishment it contains for his own soul. He will soon find that the experience of his own heart will win its way to the hearts of others. As painted victuals can not satisfy the appetite, so putting imaginary cases and speaking from without, is powerless and lifeless."

As we read these forcible words, they suggested to us what may be reckoned one of the peculiar perils of ministers of the Gospel, and the only security against it. The peril is this, that on account of the constant necessity laid upon them of producing sermons for their congregations, they will often preach and say what their own hearts do not feel, or have not proved by actual experience. In other words, the danger is one of affectation, of speaking from without, instead of from within, after an inward realization of the truth. For instance, the Sabbath is approaching, and we have, as yet, nothing prepared for our congregations. We open our Bibles and seek for a text upon which to base a sermon. We find one, guided in our choice by some recent event of general interest, or the religious impressions of the season of the year, by a conversation had with some of our people, or by what seems to be mere chance. We then see what we can make out of it, what doctrine of faith, what lessons of conduct, what encouragement and what consolation. The sermon, which is the result of our

study and meditation, may be a natural and legitimate outgrowth from the text, like a plant from its seed, or it may be a forced and artificial product, obtained by some ingenious method of accommodation, analogous to grafting in fruit culture. However this may be, all our study and labor are directed to the end of composing a sermon with which to meet our congregations the next Sabbath. We are liable, therefore, to look at the truth as it applies to them, and not as it also relates to ourselves. We subject it to the examination of the head, without always taking care first to test it by trial of the heart. We consider it critically, and not experimentally.

Such a practice carries with it a double danger. First: that of subsiding into a low state of personal religion, where one will have no growth in spirituality. Secondly: that of giving erroneous instruction. Let us take into consideration each of these specified particulars, that we may know how real is the danger alleged. Christian ministers, as a class, ought never to forget that they are sinful men as well as their hearers, and as much need the instruction and enlightenment of God's word. As it is written of the ancient high priest, that he needed to offer up sacrifice daily, first for his own sins, and then for the people's, so it may be said of the ministers of the Gospel.

He must apply the means of grace to his own heart as well as to the hearts of his hearers. If all Scripture is profitable to them for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness, it is equally so to him. He is a fellow pilgrim with them, and needs not only to point the way, but to walk in it himself. The word which he ministers is a lamp to his own feet as well as to theirs. He is not, therefore, to stand still, contenting himself with throwing forward the light over the way they should tread, but carrying the lamp in his hand to go in it himself before them, as their leader and guide. If they need to watch and pray lest they fall into temptation, he needs to watch and pray for the same cause; if they must abstain from fleshly lusts, beware of covetousness and not be conformed to this world, he must do these things for the same reasons as he gives for their doing them. He is compassed about with infirmities as well as they.

When a physician is sick, if he is not an imposter, he will

take the remedies which he prescribes to others afflicted with the same ills. And the family cook, being subject to hunger, must take of the food which she prepares for others. But while this seems to be a very obvious truth, to which no one would find any difficulty in assenting, we apprehend that in actual practice it is sometimes forgotten.

In the stress laid upon us of providing spiritual food for our congregations, we are in danger of neglecting to take it ourselves. While constantly engaged with their infirmities and wants, and ever devising remedies for them, we may overlook the fact that we, being also children of infirmity and want, require the same. We not unfrequently observe something like this. The censors of society, who make it their business to detect and rebuke the faults of their fellow-men, are often found possessing the same, seemingly unconscious of inconsistency. Where one's business is to care for others, it is a sort of natural consequence that he should neglect himself. Thus one may acquire great keenness in detecting the mote which has lodged in his brother's eye and skill to extract it, while a beam of the very same kind imperceptibly forms in his own. We once heard of a good minister whose sermons upon the duties of patience and gentleness were excellent, but he himself was often known to be very querulous and irritable, so that his listeners secretly smiled to think that he did not any better take home in self-application the admirable teaching of his discourses.

Where one looks at truth principally in its application to others rather than to himself, the truth after a while loses its operative force upon him. This is what Robertson meant when he spoke of "the hardening influence of preaching upon ministers," and warned them to guard against it. The danger is a real one and such as we are not altogether unacquainted with. We know how perilous it is to one's moral and religious safety, to listen to truth which he does not practice. We often warn our impenitent hearers against it, exhorting them to beware of neglecting the truth too long, but after awhile they become insensible to its power.

The apostle Paul describes the fearful result by two expressive words: "Past feeling." And what is it to be past feeling in the sense indicated? To have the religious sensibili-

ties grown callous to the impressions of divine truth, so that one can feel no motive leading him to repentance and godly living. His perceptions remain clear and true enough, and he is able to see what his duty is with sufficient plainness, but he feels no impulse towards it. The propelling force is gone. It is death in life, like a paralysis which affects the working hands, though all the remaining members of the body are alive and sound. And this direful condition results from being familiar with the truth without obeying it. The only safeguard against it is to act promptly and appropriately whenever the truth is perceived, and the duty to which it calls is ascertained.

It is obvious, therefore, that if for any cause, we direct our attention more to the exposition and inculcation of truth, than to acting upon it ourselves, we are exposed to the danger under consideration. Thus it may sometimes happen, that while his knowledge of the Scriptures is far superior to that of any of his people, a minister's real piety will fall behind that of some of them.

With more to feed his faith and quicken his ardor and kindle his devotion, he is surpassed in these very particulars by some humble child of God, whose knowledge in comparison with his is but small. His mind is like a clayey soil, which is impervious to the rain that falls upon it. Though the rain descends in floods, as it does not sink into the ground, but runs away elsewhere, the verdure is not so thick nor the flowers so abundant in that spot as in places having a porous soil, though there they have scarcely more than the night dew to water them. The case is not wholly singular or without a parallel elsewhere. We have often been told that policemen are sometimes found to be wicked and profligate in character. As it is their business to look out for rogues and law-breakers, one might suppose at first thought that, on this account, their reverence for law, and regard for the well-being of society would become so enhanced that they would be the most scrupulous of all men in their careful observance of what was right and orderly.

But holding a place in relation to civil law, analogous to that of ministers with respect to the Christian religion, they are prone to carelessness as regards a strict observance of them. It seems that while jealously exacting from others a due respect



for those laws, they themselves sometimes trample upon them. Prompt to ferret out evil-doers and bring them to punishment, they indulge themselves in a criminal laxity with respect to the very same things.

It looks as if they regarded the whole field of public welfare, which is fenced in and guarded by civil statutes and penalties, somewhat as an English squire or nobleman regards his park, a place where he himself is at liberty to pursue his game at pleasure, but no one else can do it without being arrested and punished as a poacher. Such treatment of the majesty of law by its authorised guardians is like that said to be rendered by pagan priests to their idols, who require of the people in their behalf an awful reverence and scrupulous worship, punishing with death the least breach of propriety or profane touch as a sacrilege; but they themselves, secluded in the privacy of the temples, buffet, scrub, and roughly handle them with the most irreverent levity. The fault of these public servants is that they do not carry their zeal far enough. They should not be any less intolerant than they are of infractions of the law; they would be justified in the most rigid enforcement of its every demand, but they should regard themselves as subject to it, and be no less stern in exacting from themselves as true an obedience, and as conscientious a respect for its authority as they insist upon in another. To do otherwise is demoralizing. Every improper liberty which they take; every unlawful transgression allowed in their own practice is sure to blunt the moral sense, and deprave the heart.

Men suppose that one's growth in personal religion will keep even pace with his attainments in religious knowledge. It is perhaps a just and reasonable expectation. But when the fact is otherwise, and the conscious heart is aware how far short it comes of that piety which is imparted to it, because of its advantages of knowledge, the man feels convicted of a fault, as though he were acting a part, walking in craftiness and handling the word of God deceitfully, rather than by manifestation of the truth commending himself to every man's conscience in the sight of God.

If it comes to this, one is in danger indeed. He stands almost on the threshold of infidelity. Not realizing an inner life

accordant with the truth which his head has attained, he is tempted to doubt that truth, or whether the results commonly accredited to it may not arise from a mistaken fanaticism. If the causes of the decline of the German churches into rationalism and infidelity, in the beginning of the present century, were known, we suspect this would be found to have been one of them. They had previously sunk into a dead formalism, and the transition from that to the other things was easy and natural. Men can not easily endure the constant sting of self-reproach which attends a low state of spirituality. If they can not get rid of it by attaining to a higher and better state, they may do so by plunging into unbelief.

We now come to the other danger referred to, as resulting from not speaking from the heart, viz. : That of giving erroneous instruction. We might dismiss this division of our subject with the pertinent question of Christ: "How can the blind lead the blind?" or with the dictum of Anselm, which has ever commanded the assent of the living church: *Qui expertus non fuerit, non intelliget*: He who has had no experience can not understand, and not understanding of course is incompetent to instruct. But perhaps it may be well to linger upon the point awhile for the sake of illustration and enforcement. With the writer quoted at the beginning of the essay, we believe that one who would truly preach the Gospel "must live upon the Gospel," or, as he further on says, that "the preacher must first place himself under the power of the text, and with prayer and self-examination seek to discover how it applies to himself, before he can successfully explain and enforce it upon others." His sermons should impress his hearers like narrations of experience, rather than as conclusions of the intellect. The thoughts which compose them should seem spontaneous, not artificial; offered, not sought for. They should gush from a natural spring, and not be brought up by wheel and axle. They should flow from the heart as from a brimming fountain, not be drawn from the head as from a forcing pump. The sermon should have the characteristics of truth and life, and not of unreality and death; it should be a growth and not merely an ingenious or elaborate composition. It is related of the celebrated Welch preacher, Christmas Evans, that when he was to prepare a sermon to

preach, the first thing he did was "to take his text up into his heart," as he phrased it. He did this by prayer and intense reflection. Sometimes this effort of previous verification was like wrestling with an unseen antagonist. He appeared to strain every faculty of soul and body. He had throes of spirit like those of one in birth pangs. But when the hour of preaching came he was calm and serene as the unclouded sky, and his discourse was the speaking of one who knew whereof he affirmed. It fell upon the ears of his hearers as the speech of one who had talked with God, or just come from the eternal world, and was familiar with its realities. It produced swift conviction and had great effect. Men felt that one could not preach as he did unless he preached the living truth, and feeling this they submitted to it.

The effect on his congregation of a revival of religion upon a minister's preaching has often been remarked. A new warmth and vitality are infused into it, so that it seems as if it came from another man. His people say of him: "How earnest he is, and his words are as goads, driving us to duty." If there was ever any doubt of the sincerity of his convictions there is none now. His tones tremulous with emotion, his eyes with their look of entreaty, the natural eloquence of voice and look and gesture, joined with a more direct and pointed style of address, form a product that can not be counterfeited, and carry with them convincing evidence. This new energy and animation in the preacher is not the mere effect of the unusual excitement which exists at the time. Neither is it wholly due to the encouragement and elation which the success of his labors is having; but to the fact of his being more frequent in prayer at this time, and having his heart quickened by feeding it more abundantly with the truths of the word. He renews and deepens the religious impressions of his soul by carrying them to that word, and subjecting them again to its power.

The effect of this upon his thoughts, feelings, and entire spirit is to give them a freshness, vividness, and warmth which are refreshing to all who come within the reach of his influence and teaching. It is like what occurs when the old, defaced, worn-out coin of our money currency is recalled from circulation back to the Government mint, that it may be recoined and appear

again bright, clear cut, and having its original weight. A man who constantly is renewing in this wise the impressions and experience of his heart by daily intercourse with divine truth, and a faithful application of it to himself will always preserve the freshness of his thoughts. His preaching will remain as vitalizing at the last as it was at first. It will never degenerate into hollow cant, or seem stale or lifeless.

Among the other eminent services which the late J. W. Alexander rendered to the American church and its ministry, especially the younger members of it, we reckon that not the least, by which he insisted that the best, and only way, in fact, in which a minister could maintain the freshness and interest of his preaching was by the constant, reverent, obedient study of God's word. Whoever will give heed to it, is not likely to be shelved from the ministerial work on account of dulness as he grows old, but he will improve and ripen with time, and his later preaching will be as much superior to that of his early ministry, as a ripe, mellow peach is better than a green one.

We have said that one who preaches what he has not first verified in the experience of his heart is in danger of teaching error. The error will consist in impression, perhaps, more than in the matter set forth. The latter may be theoretically correct, the doctrine of the sermon may be theoretically sound, but as it is merely a fabrication of the head, its impressions will be no other than that of a fabrication, that is, it will not have the thrilling, convincing effect of truth. That this may be obtained, he must first take it up into his heart and live it.

Let us attempt an illustration from nature. There are various natural substances, the elementary composition of which has been accurately ascertained by chemical analysis. But it is not possible to manufacture those substances by purely artificial processes from their elements. One can not make sugar, for instance, by combining carbon and water, its components, even though he combines them in exactly the same proportions as they are found in the natural product. No one tasting the mixture would call it sugar. The only way in which this can be produced is to throw these elements into the laboratory of nature, and allow her to produce it in accordance with her laws. To be sure, men assume that it is an article of manufacture. But how or in

what sense is it such? Only as they have been able to produce it by strict obedience to the conditions which she has imposed.

"The powers of nature, or, in other words, the properties of matter, do all the work when once objects are put into the right position. This one operation, of putting things into fit places for being acted upon by their own internal forces, or by those residing in other natural objects, is all that man does or can do. He only moves one thing to or from another. He moves a spark to fuel and it ignites, and by the force generated in combustion it converts into sugar the cane juice which he has previously moved to the spot. He has no other means of acting on matter than by moving it."—*Mill's Political Economy.*

The composition of a tree or plant may likewise be discovered by the same mode of analysis. But one can not by any amount of ingenuity manufacture one or the other. The only way is to drop the seed in the ground, and let nature develop it by the action of sunshine and rain, heat and moisture, into the proper product.

It is somewhat so with all right preaching. It is not enough in order to make a sermon, that one have an intellectual acquaintance with the truths that should enter into it, or mingle them in just proportions. The heart must vitalize them after having been first quickened by them. They must be transformed into living forcible verities, as nature transforms her elementary substances when she binds them together by some living principle of growth. Art can not do the work of life. She may construct a figure in which every bone and muscle, vein and artery of the human body shall be accurately represented; but, after all, it will be but a manikin. She has no power to send the blood coursing through the veins, to set the lungs agoing, and convert it into a living, moving, thinking man. Life alone can do that. No more can mere art produce good, effective preaching. However admirable and orderly the work, the instincts of man will pronounce it a counterfeit. It will not afford spiritual nourishment. It sets before them painted victuals, and not the real bread of life. They will say of a man who speaks from no deeper knowledge, that he talks about his subject, but he does not talk it. He speaks of the kingdom of God from hearsay, not from his own personal

knowledge and recollection. He seems to tell them of what others have seen, but not what he himself has seen.

It remains to consider briefly : What will save us from these dangers. It has been already implied in what has gone before. We must take heed how we read and study the word of God. We must not read it merely to obtain material or suggestions for sermons and exhortations, but always and chiefly for spiritual edification. We should absorb the truth before we venture to give it forth. After it has enriched our own hearts and wrought its due effects upon ourselves, then we may proceed to apply its teachings to others. As the earth drinks in the rain and dissolves into it the various substances which the plants require for food ere she yields it up again for their nourishment, so should we first receive into our own souls the word which we study, and impregnate it with the evidences of self-conviction and reality, before we attempt to use it for the edification of others. By a change of figure we might regard ourselves as performing for our hearers the work of a telescope with respect to the truths which the Bible contains. That is, we endeavor to bring those solemn verities more distinctly and vividly home to them, so that they shall be fully impressed with their importance and inclined to conform themselves to them. But it is not enough that the rays of light fall on the object glass of the telescope ; they must pass through it ere a magnified image of the object looked at can be presented to the beholder. So must the rays of truth, shining forth from the word of God, penetrate the heart of the preacher and be brought to the focal point of a clear recognition in him, before a clear and stirring impression of it will be likely to be had by the hearer. Better than such elaborate imagery, perhaps, is the plainest statement of the case. If we would successfully persuade men to piety, we must be men of piety ourselves. Our success in preaching the Gospel will be proportioned to the faithfulness with which we live it, and not to the learning and skill with which we expound it. It is all comprehended in the advice of St. Paul, who next to his divine master, was the greatest of preachers, to Timothy : "Take heed [first] unto thyself, and [then] unto the doctrine ; . . . for in doing this, thou shalt both save thyself and them that hear thee."

By such a personal self-application of the word, the preacher will gain, not only in respect to the force and truthfulness of his sermons, but also in respect to the ease with which he can produce them. For it has the effect of vastly increasing the productive power of the mind. He will write from an overflowing soul, and the difference between composition in such a state and one that is spiritually dull and uninspired by the inward revelation of the truth, is the difference of drawing from "a well of water whose waters fail not" and a cistern which contains no more than what has been poured into it.

De Quincy divides literature into two classes; the literature of knowledge and the literature of power. "The function of the first is to teach; the function of the second is to move. The first is a rudder, the second is an oar or sail." The one informs or communicates something new; the other, without perhaps imparting any thing new, excites, inspires and exalts. To the first class belong encyclopedias, scientific treatises and books of discovery; to the other, poetry and the forms of eloquence, whatever aims to affect men through the imagination and the heart. *Paradise Lost*, the tragedies of Shakespeare, the orations of Burke and the sermons of Massillon are examples of it. Following this fine classification, the Bible must be placed in the literature of power, and it is not merely a sample, one book among many, but the very highest in the class. It stirs the depths of our being more profoundly, quickens into life more and higher faculties than any other. In its operation upon the spiritual nature it stands single and alone. No other book in literature can do its work. But whether it fully accomplishes this depends upon its being absorbed into the soul. There is no possibility of realizing the deep moving impulse and spiritual awakening which it is fitted by divine appointment to produce, but by passively submitting the heart to its influence, any more than it is possible to feel the power of noble music without a surrender of the soul to its operation. When, however, the power of divine truth has thrilled through the depths of man's spiritual being, and revealed him to himself, its effect does not end there in a mere transient sensation; the light which it flashes through the consciousness is not simply a flash like that of lightning in the night, whose illumination is



but for an instant, and then succeeded by a deeper gloom. The thrilling touch awakens the dead soul to a permanent life; the sudden light is the breaking of a spiritual dawn which grows brighter and brighter to the perfect day, instead of operating as a galvanic shock, which can only impart a momentary and hideous semblance of life to what is dead. It acts like the touch of Christ upon the ruler's daughter, by which she was made to arise and walk in actual existence. In other words, it evinces its right to be classed in the literature of power by awakening faculties capable of exerting an independent power of their own. As health gives vigor to a sickly, languid frame, and makes what once might have required painful and even impossible exertion, become a joyous play and easy exercise, so does the spiritual life, elicited by the operation of divine truth upon the heart, produce an increased ability to handle the themes relating to that truth, and change to a pleasure what otherwise were a drudgery.

For such reasons as these we feel that the importance of giving careful attention to the religious discipline of the heart, so as to make it the seat of a truly vital, growing piety, can not be too strongly urged upon those engaged in the work of the Christian ministry. That we shall care enough for the cultivation of our minds, there is little cause for fear. The incentives to do this are too immediate and pressing to allow us to neglect it. The faults of the head, though not so disastrous, are more open to observation than those of the heart; we therefore make haste to correct the former and delay to do so with the latter. These may wait too long. There is danger of the evil becoming inveterate and irremediable if suffered thus to remain uncorrected. It would be a better plan to reverse the usual order of our care, so as to be more anxious to have the heart right and to feed it with the truth it requires. Our reading of God's word should rather be for self-improvement than to find matter for talk and sermon making. We should not find our material for the latter purposes at all diminished by this course, but largely increased. The quickened heart would discover ten thoughts suited to its need where but one was found before, and all would be more effective than any thing which the skilled head alone could devise. For then a description by St. Paul

of the effect of true preaching will be verified to us. "And thus are the secrets of his heart made manifest; and so falling down on his face, he will worship God, and report that God is in you of a truth."

---

## ARTICLE V.

### THE ENGLISH CONGREGATIONAL COLLEGES.

AN American in England, going up to Oxford and Cambridge to see those venerable institutions for himself, realizes, what he had dimly learned before from printed accounts, how different the English universities are from American colleges, and how different are the idea of a college and the idea of a university in the two countries. If he also visits the "dissenting" colleges of England, for example, the Congregational, he becomes acquainted with another class of institutions, differing from the Oxford and Cambridge colleges in not being organically connected with any national university, and differing also, as they do, from American colleges, in this, among other things, that they impart both what is culled in this country collegiate, and also what is called theological education. He hears them called "theological colleges," a name quite unknown in his native land. Since the day in August, 1807, when Madam Phœbe Phillips of Andover, "relict of Samuel Phillips, Esq., late Lieut. Governor," etc., and John Phillips, Jun., "son of the said Samuel and Phœbe," and Samuel Abbot, Esquire, established and endowed "a public theological institution in Phillips Academy," using the word "seminary" throughout the constitution they signed, all such institutions have been known among us as theological seminaries. The English Congregationalists have one institution under the name at Hackney.<sup>1</sup> Its sixty first report lies before us. It does not differ particu-

<sup>1</sup> "Hackney Theological Seminary." There are besides, six "private theological seminaries" where ministerial candidates are prepared for college

larly from the colleges, so called; the classics, mathematics, mental and moral science, rhetoric and logic are taught, as well as Hebrew, biblical criticism, theology, homiletics, and church history. "It was designed originally to prepare suitable men for itinerant service; but the course of education has been so raised and extended as to place it in all respects on a par with the other colleges."

No class of Christians in Great Britain, indeed, makes the distinction between college and theological seminary which is so familiar to us. The terms are in that land entirely interchangeable. Our well-defined distinction between them seems almost impossible to the English mind. In the universities the clergy of the Establishment have always received from one corps of teachers both secular and ministerial education. So in the Congregational colleges. Several of these have but two professors, viz., Rotherham, Brecon, and Western Colleges, one of whom is professor of classics and mathematics, the other is a theological tutor. At Spring Hill, (Birmingham), Lancashire (Manchester), and Cheshunt, founded by Lady Huntingdon at Talgath, with which Newport Pagnel is now incorporated, there are three professors. In two of them the mathematics and classics are divided, and in one exegetical theology is taught by one professor, and dogmatic and general theology and philosophy by another; while in one of them philosophy and Hebrew are put into the same department, and in another mathematics, philosophy, and Hebrew.<sup>1</sup> Airedale has four professors, one of theology, one of pastoral theology, one of classics, and one of mathematics and philosophy. New College, St. John's Wood, London, formed by the consolidation of Coward, Highbury and Homerton,<sup>2</sup> has a faculty of five, a teacher of Greek and Latin, Dr. Wm. Smith of the dictionaries, one of metaphysics and logic, with the English language, one of German and Hebrew, one of mathematics, natural philosophy, and ecclesiastical history, and one of theology, Dr. Robert Halley, with a lecturer on chemistry and natural his-

<sup>1</sup> In Lancashire college, Henry Rogers, author of "The Eclipse of Faith," teaches theology and moral philosophy.

<sup>2</sup> There is still a Homerton college, Rev. W. J. Unwin, LL.D., Principal; but it is a training institution for teachers in infant and juvenile schools.

tory. Of course, any thing like the thoroughness of our separate college and seminary courses of study is quite impossible. At Airedale, Lancashire, and New Colleges, there is the nearest approximation to this, the whole term of study being five years, and in the last institution the curriculum being divided into a literary course of two years and a theological course of three years. The same division obtains at Spring Hill, the theological course, however, occupying but four sessions. How long these sessions are we can not discover from documents either personally gathered in the country or kindly sent to us, but we presume they are of three months each. In all, there are thirteen<sup>1</sup> Congregational colleges in England, Scotland, and Wales. The Hebrew and Aramæan languages are taught at Spring Hill; the Hebrew and Chaldee at Western College; the Hebrew, Chaldee and Syriac at Airedale. The modern languages, as well as the English, are in the curriculum of several of the institutions. By only part of them is anything more than a good English education required of candidates for admission. At Airedale, which stands high among them, applicants must pass an examination in the first book of the *Æneid*, the first book of Xenophon's *Anabasis*, and the first book of Euclid's *Elements*; "but the committee have power to modify this rule in the case of pious young men of decided promise as preachers, whose previous educational advantages have not been great." At Rotherham an examination is had, partly oral, partly written, in the English language and history, arithmetic, Paley's *Evidences*, and in a general knowledge of the Scriptures. At Lancashire an acquaintance with the elements of Greek and Latin is required, with an examination in the first two books of the *Æneid*, the Gospel of Luke in Greek, the principles of arithmetic, and the first book of Euclid. At Spring Hill candidates are examined in the sixth book of the *Æneid*, the first of the *Anabasis*, the first of Euclid, "and arithmetic and algebra as far as fractions." At Bala, North Wales, "the candidate must not only be conversant with the Welsh language, but with arithmetic and the English tongue also." Brecon requires more. At

<sup>1</sup> Mission College, Highgate, in connection with the London Missionary Society, is not here included. Here "the missionary students spend the last year of their professional training, pursuing studies peculiar to missionary life and labors."

New College, London, which perhaps stands highest, "each candidate is examined respecting his literary knowledge, religious history, and general aptitude for study and ministerial labor." At Western College, Plymouth, "he must submit to examination respecting his religious principles and purposes, as also respecting his literary attainments and mental resources." Something like these requirements, but varying in each, obtains in other institutions, while in some no previous examination is had. In several of them the period of study is lengthened to supply defects of elementary education; at New College students are allowed to devote a part of their time, during the first year, to preparatory studies, for which elementary classes are formed whenever necessary; at Lancashire a separate preliminary course is founded; at the Theological Hall of the Congregational churches of Scotland, which most nearly resembles our American theological seminary, though it has but two professors, "the students, for the most part, attend the University of Edinburgh for their general learning"; "in cases where elementary education is required, a fifth year may be added."

In the Scotch universities, if we may judge by Aberdeen, the requirements are not so severe as to imply great proficiency in those who pass from them to theological study. "The matriculative examination is a very easy one," says a statement we obtained in Scotland, "and there is seldom an instance of a boy being rejected. It is enough to be able to translate and construe a chapter in Cæsar's Commentaries. Less Greek is looked for, and if a boy have some acquaintance with *ῥόπτω* he will pass. The standard has been raised a little lately." The first session at Aberdeen is devoted to Greek and Latin; the second and third to the same studies, with mathematics and natural history, the proportion of classics in the third being less; the fourth to mathematics with logic and moral philosophy. Sir William Hamilton, as is well known, withdrew for many years from the Senatus of the University of Edinburgh because no other accepted so little knowledge for the degree of A. M. "The Church of Scotland was neither the offspring of learning nor of power: it was the choice of an unlearned people, established by a revolution." "Theological learning remained superfluous, if not unsafe." Classical education he represented

as still more depressed. Dr. Leonard Schmitz, on retiring from the rectorship of the high school of Edinburgh, (1865) complained that the universities still include an amount of elementary instruction which is wholly disgraceful. "After all that has been done of late years in the way of amendment and elevation," says the *North British Mail*, "the Scottish universities have not yet risen" (the University Reform Act notwithstanding,) "to a much loftier part, at least in some branches of academic learning, than that of upper schools." The evil is ascribed to the defects of the preparatory schools, and the lack of a national board of university examiners. In the United Presbyterian Church the principal defect of their training of ministers is acknowledged to be "the want of an efficient, impartial, and uniform examination of all candidates for admission to the theological hall, which shall preclude the entrance of any who do not possess competent talents and attainments." Many of the deficiencies of the British pulpit in all denominations are unquestionably owing to defects of preparatory training, before the study of theology is commenced. In that the old country remarkably resembles the new.

At a college conference held in London twenty two years ago, the late Dr. W. H. Stowell, then of Rotherham College, objected to candidates for English pulpits resorting to American seminaries, on the ground that equal advantages could be well found nearer home, as "in London, Edinburgh, Glasgow, Halle, or Bonn." Dr. Stowell admitted, however, that "the advantages of an American theological seminary are these: the instruction of distinct professors, a sifted result of German studies, the fruits of some learning, of approved piety and of reverent freedom in theological inquiry, together with boldness of conception in connection with public service." The late Dr. H. F. Burder, then of Bala, North Wales, arguing for special attention to theological learning in the latter years of the collegiate course, and for two full years<sup>1</sup> of study in theology, commended emphatically the order and distribution of the Scottish universities and theological institutions.

<sup>1</sup> Dr. John Pye Smith, after forty years' experience at Homerton, said three for "the almost exclusive study of Bible interpretation, divinity and church history." He intimated that the time then afforded was less than two years

"After passing through the grammar school, the student is usually placed under the professors of Latin and Greek for about three years; he is then engaged in the study of logic, of rhetoric, of mathematics, of mental, of moral, and of natural philosophy, for three years more; and if he is destined for the ministry in the established church, he pursues the study of theology, and of related subjects, during four additional years. If he belongs to the Secession church, he is placed, after his graduation at college, under the professors of their divinity hall, and his attention is entirely directed to those studies which have the most important bearing on the Christian ministry. This arrangement, recommended by long experience of its advantages and efficiency, as well as by the order of nature, can not be disregarded without serious injury."

Dr. William Smith, then of Highbury, late of New College, pleading for adequate preparatory training, stated that it had been the practice, till very recently, to admit young men into the English colleges who possessed hardly any acquaintance with the first elements of the subjects taught. He insisted upon an accurate knowledge of Latin and Greek grammar, and sufficient acquaintance with the vocabularies of the languages to enable a student to read an easy author in each; a clear idea of the nature of mathematical reasoning, with the mastery of the first book of Euclid, fractional and decimal arithmetic, and algebra as far as simple equations; and also some facility in the use of English, with an acquaintance with the elements of Greek, Roman, and English history, these matters to occupy one year of study under the tuition of some competent minister, the expense to be borne by the colleges. This plan was preferred to that of preparatory teaching in the existing colleges or the founding of a preparatory institution. Even in the five years' course, said Dr. Smith, "less than two is left for the exclusive study of theology." Evidently it is quite impossible to make needful improvement in either preparatory, collegiate, or theological education, where all three are undertaken in the same institutions, and the time of attendance is limited to four or five years. Evidently nothing like the advance we constantly see in our own country is to be expected. Dr. Robert Vaughan, in his Notes on the United States since the War, published after his return from the Boston National



Council,<sup>1</sup> commends, with qualifications, the diffusion of the higher education among us. Alluding to the common school system, he says: "Each State, moreover, has a number of efficient grammar schools dotted over it, where an education preliminary to entering the classes of the colleges or the universities may be obtained, also free from cost. These universities or colleges are so called, because their object is to secure a general collegiate training. In this respect they are distinguished from the theological seminaries and the medical colleges." He estimates the total attendance in 1864 at fourteen thousand; Students in theological seminaries, Catholic and Protestant, a little above one thousand.

"The reader will see that this network of instruction, spread over the whole country, is something extraordinary. What is the result? I shall not attempt to answer. The reader will call to mind the names of Americans who have distinguished themselves in science, in history, in philosophy, in poetry, and in general literature. Still, in proportion to a population of thirty one millions, the *athletæ* are few and far between. Nor should this surprise us. America has done well to have done so much. She is still in her seed-time. English booksellers know that for the best books in all departments of learning they have had no customers like America for thirty years past. In history, in patristics, and in theology the libraries of the United States are rich beyond anything commonly supposed in this country. If there are few professors in their theological seminaries who have made themselves felt in England as they should have done, the learning and the ability existing among the men who fill those offices are highly creditable to them. English Nonconformists greatly need a few such theologians as Professor Park of Andover."

At the late College Conference in London in 1865, the following question was proposed by the Committee who called it together: "The establishment of a theological college for students who have already completed a satisfactory literary curriculum." One of the essayists, Rev. J. M. Charlton of Western College, suggested that all the colleges save one should become

<sup>1</sup> *British Quarterly Review*, Oct. 1865, pp. 433—497. Dr. V. was formerly Principal of Lancashire College.

"Preparatory institutions, that is, affording classical, mathematical, and scientific training, in preparation for a more extensive and special divinity and ministerial college, wherein all biblical, dogmatic, ecclesiastical and homiletic studies might be more efficiently conducted; to which the students from the others might be at length transferred; and from which, as from a common centre, all young ministers might finally go forth to take those stations in the churches for which they might be found fitted."

Dr. Falding of Rotherham urged the adoption of the American plan, substantially, for the more complete ministerial training of advanced students. "The increased amount of attention paid to literary studies makes it increasingly difficult," he observed, "to do justice to studies theological." No action, however, has followed these suggestions. One essayist suggested that a change might come when the sectarian restrictions at Cambridge and Oxford are removed; adding: "The revolution which this plan would produce in our collegiate system is enough to make one tremble." It is widely felt in England that there are too many colleges<sup>1</sup> and none of sufficiently high character; propositions for combining two or more are often started; but the questions, which shall cease to be, and which shall go on, which shall be elevated, and which depressed, present insurmountable difficulties. It is an illustration of the fixed ways of English life, and of the improbability of reform and advance, even among Dissenters, that four of these institutions are half a century, and four more a century old, and no theological institution, as such, yet exists in England.

The limited number of students in these institutions is a matter of surprise to an educated American. One of the things Dr. Vaughan notices in his account of that network of instruction, which he pronounced extraordinary, is this: "The number of students in each in 1864 varied from twenty in some, to between eight or nine hundred in others." At the late London Confer-

<sup>1</sup> More than twenty years ago Prof. B. B. Edwards said in the *Bibliotheca Sacra* (Vol. III. No. XII., p. 777), "The number of these academies is thought by many of their patrons to be much too large. By the building of railways in every direction much of the supposed necessity for some of these institutions has been taken away. Birmingham, for example, is only three or four hours from Manchester. Still it is found to be very difficult to amalgamate them. In some cases local feelings and prejudices in favor of particular institutions are very strong. In other instances legal difficulties stand in the way." All the difficulties have been increased since Prof. Edwards wrote.

ence, Dr. Vaughan said: "Up to within the last seven years the great want of our colleges had been, for some while past, the want of men. Since then, from some cause which I hardly know how to explain, the quantity has increased so that all our colleges have been full." It has diminished since that time from four hundred and fifty five to two hundred and ninety three. New College, which has had the largest attendance, has increased from fifty two to fifty three; the Congregational Institute, Nottingham, from forty two to fifty three; the Gloucestershire Institute, Bristol, from thirteen to sixteen; Cheshunt from twenty seven to thirty one; and Hackney from twenty to twenty one. But Brecon has declined from forty five students to thirty three; Bala from twenty one to fifteen; the Theological Hall, Edinburgh, from twenty to twelve; Airedale, from eighteen to fifteen; Western, from seventeen to fifteen; Lancashire from forty three to thirty two; and Spring Hill from thirty to twelve. In the Presbyterian college, Caermarthen, Wales, the number of "Orthodox Independent students for the ministry" has decreased from thirty four to twenty one. We are not sure whether the attendance at this college is included in both of the aggregates given above. In former years it has been named in the tables of Congregational colleges in the *Year Book*. It was once a Congregational seminary; but some of the tutors became Arians and Socinians, and the Independents withdrew and established Brecon College. Caermarthen was originally formed by the union (1719) of a local institution with the old Tewksbury Dissenting Academy where Bishop Butler and Archbishop Secker had their first training. It is now owned and controlled by the Unitarians, the management being in the hands of the London Presbyterian Board. There is, however, a fund for the education of Orthodox Independents, the income of which is about five hundred and thirty pounds per annum. There is a Congregational theological professor, Rev. William Morgan, who teaches moral philosophy, natural theology, the evidences of Christianity, biblical criticism and interpretation, homiletics and the composition of sermons. "Systematic theology is not taught professionally in the college, the students seeking instruction in that department from ministers in their own denominations." The relative

number of students is : Congregational, twenty ; Welch Methodists, (Calvinistic) three ; Unitarians, two ; Baptist, one. If any one finds it difficult to account for this small aggregate of students per annum, since both collegiate and theological students are taught together, let it be remembered that many candidates for the Congregational ministry in England commence their study elsewhere. Since the establishment of the London University metropolitan students have pursued the study of the arts and sciences in connection therewith, receiving degrees on examination.<sup>1</sup> The list of ministers in the Year Book is plentifully embellished with titles, from B. A. and LL.B. upwards, received from the English and Scotch universities. Every list of degrees conferred at the universities contains the names of students of the Dissenting academies. Our impression is, however, that these are counted in the college tables of numbers each year.

The cost of educating English Congregational ministers, estimated by the cost and expenses of the colleges, is much greater than in this country. At one of them, "where there are not more than ten or fifteen students," wrote Prof. Edwards in 1846, "the salaries of the professors amount to five or six thousand dollars." The financial reports for last year furnish the following comparisons : Western College, two professors, expenditure about six thousand dollars ; Rotherham, same faculty, expenditure a little less ; Hackney, the same, expenses between six thousand and seven thousand dollars. Spring Hill, Nottingham, Hackney, and Cheshunt, with three instructors each, expend from eight to ten thousand dollars each. Lancashire with four costs per annum about fourteen thousand dollars. New College with five, is carried on at an expense of about twenty one thousand dollars. Our estimates are made on the old basis of five dollars to the guinea ; at the recent ratio of exchange, these statements should be very much increased. The cost of the buildings, grounds, etc., is many times greater than in the case of American institutions with many more instructors, and several times as many students. The style of furnishing is also far more costly and luxurious. Probably the style indulged in at the universities has had its effect. We looked in

<sup>1</sup> So in the Theol. Hall, Edinburgh, mentioned above.

upon students' rooms at Lancashire and Spring Hill, which would make the eyes of young theologians and collegians in our land, especially at the West, open wide with amazement. The taste and elegance of architecture, the beauty and cost of grounds which we noticed there, and at New College, London, made us remember with a sigh many a bleak campus and many a pile of "barracks" in our native land. Usually, as at the universities, the family residences of the faculty are in the buildings. There are but few heads of American Congregational colleges who are so fortunate in their condition that they would not envy the quarters of Principal Barker at Moseley, or Henry Rogers at Manchester. A gentleman from Canada lately undertook to show a community in Iowa, of somewhat aspiring tendencies in respect to education, that "a college could be established as easily as an academy." It would take the funds and subscriptions of half a dozen of our Western colleges to found and set in operation one of the Dissenting colleges of England.

The students also are far better provided for than among us, in the amount and quality of accommodations. At Spring Hill each student has an attractive and convenient study-room to himself on the first floor, and a separate single bed-room, spacious and pleasant, in the second story, directly above. All board within college walls, eating together in a handsome refectory on the first floor, front, beneath the library, and opposite the chapel. The edifices which we saw show the influence of college architecture at the universities. Some of them surround three sides of a rectangle, a striking and beautiful form of structure, with a central front tower over the principal entrance. Inside the rectangle, under the first floor, is a covered walk running round the whole building for exercise, the story sheltering it being supported by massive stone arches. Board is furnished in some instances, if necessary, at the cost of the college; in others, students board and lodge out of college with families, or in houses, approved and registered for the purpose. At Lancashire, Spring Hill, and New College, there are scholarships for those to whom they may be awarded for merits and "exhibitions," or charity provisions for those needing aid.

Some years ago it was proposed in Yorkshire to unite Aire-

dale and Rotherham. The whole number of students would be about thirty; the increase of advantages and economy would be considerable. The same obstacles prevented it which our Methodist brethren in Iowa have encountered in attempting to make two struggling seminaries, Cornell and Fayette, into one of a better class. The friends of union in England argue that it were better every way if the newer schools were preparatory institutions, enlarging the number and improving the scholarship of students sent to the older ones. The necessity of building anew for both the Yorkshire colleges has revived recently the question of union. The premises are old, inconvenient, and much too small.

"On the ground of expense alone," says the *London Patriot*, "we should be sorry if the needless cost of maintaining two collegiate institutions should be permanently bound upon the Yorkshire churches, when they have such a large industrial population rising rapidly around them, which appeal to the most liberal sacrifice of money and effort in order to spread amongst them the vital and saving influences of evangelical truth."

The Yorkshire colleges grew up by the association of students in olden time with some able minister apt to teach, as did our first theological schools; and when, from imperfect means of travel, but a small district could look to any one source of supply.

"But the change which has come in education," says the *Patriot*, "shows the folly of perpetuating small institutions, which local necessities formerly occasioned and justified. If twelve or fifteen men were trained by a minister who was full handed with his work, he could train no more, and their education cost but little. But now the educational demands are greater, tutors are called to give their whole energy to their proper work. The cost of education has thus grown excessively, and the question arises which has escaped consideration. If the work of education now requires the continuous and entire devotion of men separated to it and qualified for it, should not more students be gathered to receive the benefits of this unremitting labor? And if the cost of education has been immensely increased by the just increase of the tutors' salaries, should it not be reduced by the enlargement of their sphere of usefulness; the increase of the number of their students? We are most firmly assured that by this means not only would the cost of education be

reduced, but the education itself would be improved. The tutorial staff of either Yorkshire college would teach more efficiently and successfully some thirty or forty students, combining the number in both colleges, than the small half-number they are now privileged to teach. By their very qualifications for their high office, we desire for them this noble sphere of influence. And it is plain that with the more animated and masterful discipline which larger numbers would evoke, the cost of the improved education would be reduced one half. Nor does the reduction of expense end here. All conversant with the working of institutions know how great the working expenses are. It can not but be improvident to maintain two institutions to do what one would do more effectively."

These suggestions acquire force from the fact that Rotherham is between Airedale and Nottingham, about forty miles from each. It is now proposed to rebuild both the Yorkshire colleges, but for different purposes, Airedale to remain what it is, and Rotherham to become "strictly and solely a theological hall," after the American fashion.

"It would thus be lifted out of all competition with all existing colleges," says the *Patriot*, "and appeal for its support to the whole country, as meeting a special want of our denomination, and raising up a special class of men for its service. Students might pass from them to it who desire a more lengthened theological curriculum; and only those students would be received into it whose previous education warranted their entering upon its higher and specific course. There can be no doubt that this scheme commends itself to a prevailing feeling that more specific theological attainments are to be desiderated in our young ministry, and that the age preëminently demands such theological training and scholarship."

Some inferences touching the multiplication of small colleges on the same field in our own land, draining the resources of the charitable, dividing the interests involved, and keeping the institutions poor and feeble, may be drawn from the fact that Airedale and Rotherham are situated in a county of immense wealth from mining, manufactures and shipping, as well as from agriculture and trade, with a population sixteen years since of nearly two millions, being about twenty five hundred to the square mile. And the suggestion that there can not be any over-multiplication of colleges in our Western States, at



least, on account of constant increase of population, loses much of its apparent force when we remember that the population of England increases at the rate of one thousand a day.

One very singular peculiarity of Congregational education in Great Britain, closely allied to all that has been stated in this article, is the practice, so different from our own, of discouraging the association of candidates for the ministry with students contemplating the other professions in the literary and scientific course. With our fathers and with us it has always been a very precious feature of our American colleges that our young pastors, lawyers, physicians, teachers, etc., have been educated together, receiving from Christian instructors a training and culture moulded and inspired by religion. With our fathers and brethren over the water it has been entirely different. A published paper of the Rev. Francis Watts, 1845, now before us, argues elaborately for "the admission of youths not preparing for the ministry into our divinity colleges." No other young men, however, than "the sons of evangelical Dissenters" are contemplated in the argument, and only some of the colleges, those affiliated, or to be affiliated, to the University of London. And the condition understood was "that the number of such general students do not exceed a fourth, or, perhaps a fifth of the whole body of students in any college." With these very important, and un-American limitations, Mr. Watts proceeds cautiously, as one who expects to encounter fixed views and formidable prejudices, to show "that the admission of such young men, under the conditions, is likely (1) to prevent the decay of piety and nonconformity in Dissenting families; (2) to promote the influence and usefulness of the Congregational ministry; and (3) to increase the efficiency of our colleges as theological seminaries." On the last point it is urged that the secular students would retain an interest in the colleges in after life, and that the income received from their board and instruction would support an increased number of candidates for the ministry, and enlarge the means of instruction. On the second point it is represented that useful friendships would be formed between the two classes of students, and the well-educated Dissenting gentleman, merchant, or professional man would cease to regard Dissenting ministers as, "with

some exceptions, a meanly educated class." On the first point it is stated as a known fact, that the younger members of influential Dissenting families very frequently abandon the ministry under which they were brought up. It was asserted some years since, in the *Quarterly Review*, that "Dissent seldom retains its hold on the same family for three generations." This is accounted for by common worldly motives, and by the fact that literary honors were to be attained only by going to Scotland for an education, or conformity, at Oxford or Cambridge, to the established creed and worship, while the moral dangers of the universities were fearfully destructive of piety. The writer meets the objection from the sad decline of piety and doctrinal soundness in the students at Northampton and Daven-try, by showing that this came not from the mingling there of secular with ministerial students, but from the absence of discipline and the training of unconverted men for the ministry; both points in respect to which Dr. Doddridge, with all his zeal for evangelical religion, was in serious error, theoretical and practical. An interesting note is added to the essay, in which the writer

"Ventures to express his deep and firm conviction that the academical isolation of our theological students, is, on the whole, rather unfavorable than otherwise to the formation of a complete ministerial character. He is of opinion that the admission into our colleges of a limited proportion of young men, early trained to those habits of social order and propriety, of which our most influential Nonconformist families exhibit some of the happiest examples in the land, would be decidedly favorable to the tone of morality as well as exterior cultivation of our students for the ministry; and that the occasional interchange of thought with young men of honorable principles, contemplating the learned professions, or preparing for the higher walks of manufacturing or commercial enterprise, would be of immense advantage in enlarging the moral perception, expanding the public spirit, and giving completeness and finish to the practical aptitudes of our young brethren. He believes this, even supposing, what, however, is practically most improbable, that none of the general students were professedly pious; and so strong is his conviction on the subject, that he would dissuade any young friend of his own from entering one of our colleges, were it not that their academical seclusion is favorably modified by the journeys and visits which attend the occasional preaching engagements of the stu-

dents, and by the long summer vacations. The human mind requires some relief in order to its healthy development; and the greater the object upon which its energies are to be concentrated, the greater is the necessity of moral support by enlargement of views *ab extra*. The preacher or pastor who, *cæteris paribus*, will be the most efficient, is he who, without ever deserting his own high position, has the faculty of throwing his mind, upon occasion, into the point of view of other men and other classes."

In accordance with these suggestions, "lay students" have been since admitted to some institutions, though others exclude all who do not contemplate the ministry. At Spring Hill, for example, "lay students, of good moral character and respectable position, are admitted on liberal terms and under special regulations." At New College, "lay students above fifteen years of age are permitted to attend the literary classes, and by special agreement, the theological." There are thirteen lay students here besides the fifty-two theological. At Western College, "lay students intending to enter as ministerial students, can attend the classes without the payment of fees." The number of such at present is two. This college is open to young men of all denominations, of approved moral character, as lay students. The fee for each class is three pounds and three shillings (three guineas, or fifteen dollars) and half that amount to the sons of ministers.

The question how to maintain the highest type of piety through the whole term of study, seems to have been thoroughly considered by the friends and instructors of the English colleges. The late John Angell James regarded the plan of the Wesleyan Methodists, appointing a chaplain in each of their theological institutions to care for the piety and ministerial character of the students, but not to teach, as an improvement on all other systems. This failing, he urged a closer intercourse between aged and eminent ministers and candidates for the sacred office while pursuing their studies. The Rev. J. B. Paton, M. A., of the Institute at Nottingham, in a published essay before us, treats this spiritual charge as laid upon the Faculty of each institution, who are selected for

"Their formative, stimulating, inspiring force of character." "If these tutors have this power, then they must feel how entirely it

lies with them, personally and inalienably, to maintain a high tone of piety in their students." "To this end, all the tutors of a college should combine, and, as do the tutors of our large schools, confer occasionally with one another, as they should confer always with God, in reference to the spiritual condition of each of their students. A worldly minded tutor, or one whose spirituality is questionable, will work the greatest detriment upon the souls of the students, and all the greater in proportion to his fame, energy, and vivid, friendly, sympathetic disposition. But if all must conspire to fulfill the chief end of a college training for the ministry, it forms the special and paramount object of the principal. Upon him devolves, in a peculiar sense, the care of the morals of the college, and this with us means Christian morality, or spirituality. He stands *in loco parentis*, and though a father may commit separate branches of learning to other masters, the character of his son is his own charge. I suggest, then, that in fulfilment of this charge, the principal of every college should devote one hour a week to a pastoral address to his students, or to simple, earnest conversation, with the view of nurturing their faith and zeal. These lectures should show them that he has a pastor's care for them."

It is recommended that an hour of the Sabbath should be taken for them; and besides that one whole day in every month should be counted holy unto the Lord, in which the students should "give themselves to fasting, devout meditation, and the reading of the word, and all of them should appear before the Lord in the assembly of the church in their college, for the breaking of bread." This ordinance is recommended to be celebrated regularly every month "in a full and solemn religious service, in which all the tutors take part, thus consecrating themselves and their students by the eating of one bread and the drinking of one cup to a fellowship in the sufferings and ministry of our crucified Redeemer." In New College "all the students of the Faculty of Arts receive religious instruction, chiefly of a practical nature," every Thursday from ten to eleven o'clock, A. M., from the principal, or president, Rev. Dr. Robert Halley.

It is also urged that no class should assemble or separate without prayer,<sup>1</sup> and that all students should be required to per-

<sup>1</sup> One is amazed in the Protestant theological lecture rooms of German universities to hear not a word of prayer offered, as at Heidelberg, for example.

form some mission service among the poor. Our English brethren are not quite agreed as to the value, for training, of this kind of service; such men as Principal Fraser of Airedale, for example, contending that an institution can not give experimental acquaintance with evangelistic and pastoral work. But our opinion is, though we can not now verify it, that some kind of Christian work is everywhere carried along with study. At Hackney there is a Village Itinerancy Society, whose report for 1864 ascribes to the ability and faithfulness with which the Hackney students have proclaimed Christ in the villages supplied "the very large demand made upon the services of the students as supplies." The open-air worship and preaching, in which England surpasses other lands, are largely maintained by their labors. At Nottingham one day a week, besides a large part of the Sabbath, is devoted to home missionary efforts and evangelism. At Bristol the students are required to engage in city and village mission work, as far as practicable, throughout their course, and the first five years after it is completed the graduates are under the control of the college committee or trustees. This same singular provision for laboring at the outset under direction prevails at Edinburgh, extending to one year after leaving the Theological Hall, balanced with a provision for aid, if necessary, from the funds of the Hall. Some of our English brethren insist strongly upon labor with the study from the outset, as indispensable. The Rev. R. W. Dale, successor of John Angell James at Birmingham, says :

"Though probably I attach as high a value to the royal science of dogmatic theology as any, and believe that it is equally presumptuous and dangerous for any one to despise the aids to the formation of his doctrinal creed, afforded by by-gone controversies, I believe that on the great doctrines which immediately underlie our preaching, a man is far more likely to arrive at the truth, if while he is studying the systems of the great masters of theological thought, he is earnestly endeavoring to save the souls of men."

Mr. Paton, quoted above, affirms that

"The real conditions that test religious opinion, that clear up difficulty and unfold the truth, are not to be found in the speculations of the study, but in the application of religious truth to the

great religious needs of men. The chief source of heresy among religious thinkers is the abandonment of that one criterion which the experience of an evangelist alone supplies."

---

## ARTICLE VI.

BENJAMIN F. HOSFORD.

*A Memorial of the Life, Character, and Death of Rev. Benjamin F. Hosford.* Cambridge: Printed at the Riverside Press. 1866.

THIS Memorial was prepared, as the preface informs us, for "Mr. Hosford's own intimate friends," and so it was "printed at the Riverside Press," not published. Yet in the hearts of many strangers what a profound and tender interest has its perusal awakened. That a character of such a peculiar and varied strength and opulence and beauty should have lived and labored so long, almost in the very heart of Massachusetts, and yet should have been so little known outside his personal friendships and the limits of his pastoral charge, has excited surprise. God makes but few such men, and he intends them to shine and glow in a limited sphere, as trees of most delicate organization and sweetest fragrance are set, not on the broad mountain tops or in the great forests, but in "a garden enclosed." So far as the influence of such a man is considered, there is no cause for regret that he did not stand more prominently before the community while he lived. That very circumstance, as it was one of the conditions of the singular beauty of his character, so neither, when rightly viewed, does it involve any limitation of his influence. If that influence was extended over a smaller surface, it reached to lower depths. There was something wonderful in the love which he inspired, and that with as beautiful an unconsciousness as that of the lily or the morning star. When the final and hopeless failure of his health had rendered inevitable the severance of the tie which had bound him so

strongly and tenderly to the one flock that had called him pastor, and he was struggling with the sadness awakened by the thought of quitting forever the pleasant parsonage where his happiest days had been spent, where his children had been born, and his darling Mattie had closed her eyes in death, he was surprised to find that another cheerful house, on the sunny slope of one of the hills which he loved, was already prepared to receive him and his family. The house and garden had been purchased, out of mere overflowing generous affection, by four friends, and there he dwelt, in a peace and thankfulness unutterable, to the end of his days, and there the widow and fatherless children are dwelling still. Benedictions on the head and heart and storehouse and barn of the men who have given us so beautiful a deed to think upon!

Mr. Hosford was born on the 11th day of November, 1817, in Thetford, Vermont; and there, amid the blended lights and shadows of an uncommonly rich and varied landscape, his first years were passed. It was the right place for Benjamin Franklin Hosford to be born in. His spirit was indigenous to the region, as much so as the magnificent elms and sugar-maples which cover its noble hill-sides, and stretch out their branches to the sky. He needed no master to help him see and appreciate the many fine pictures which reflected the sunlight of that sweet mountain home. Through all his subsequent life the memory of those bright pictures was a joy to his heart which language could only very feebly express. "I feel," he wrote in 1849, "as if the whole warp of my soul's fabric would be taken out, were I to lose the remembrances and influences of a virtuous, industrious, peaceful home among the ever-varying scenery of the country." p. 7.

"His early life," the Memoir says, "was one of rare exemption from the common foibles of youth, and of amiableness, cheerfulness, and seriousness, blended in a character of remarkable maturity and symmetry." The true explanation of this, doubtless, is contained in that simple and touching account of his religious experience given on the occasion of his uniting with the Congregational church at Dartmouth College, in the nineteenth year of his age: "I grew up into piety by baptism, religious training, and the grace of God." He graduated at



Dartmouth College in 1838, and entered at once the Theological Seminary at Andover, where he graduated in 1841, being twenty four years of age. Then he went forth to preach, with no "great sermons" in his hands, and no disposition to secure for himself a position and influence by the display of those powers which he was fully conscious of possessing. He made such exhibition of himself in the pulpit as comported with his own severe notions of the simplicity and dignity of his calling. With a faith and patience not less than his modesty and humility, he chose to bide his time. And well was his patience rewarded. After nearly three years' journeying in the wilderness, he came suddenly to a place of rest where his wanderings were speedily forgotten, and where, to the close of his ministry and his life on earth, God gave him such joy in his people's love and confidence, and in a very beautiful and happy home, as is given to but few. He was invited to supply the vacant pulpit of the Centre church in Haverhill, Mass., and the congregation discovered at once his superiority and the peculiar qualifications they desired in a pastor. The interest was mutual, decided and profound. He loved the people, and the people loved him, from the very first. The effect of time and intimate acquaintance was only to give to that first warm affection a strong foundation of respect and confidence; and so the affection grew continually, as his fine character developed and matured, year by year, in the preacher and the pastor, in strength and beauty, and the flock grew, under his loving and faithful instruction and guidance, in knowledge and faith and spiritual understanding. There was a mutual content and joy through all his lengthened pastorate of nearly eighteen years. The people desired no change, and the pastor desired none, and when, at length, the Master called him to his rest and reward, after long and painful sickness, and many alternations of hope and fear, the sorrow of the bereaved flock was much alleviated and soothed by the consideration that God had so directly and obviously disposed the whole matter of their mutual relations, in his peculiar grace, from the happy commencement to the mournful close, appointing his peaceful sleep in the beautiful cemetery whither so many members of the flock had gone before him, and where he had

so often wept with the survivors by the open graves of their dead.

Mr. Hosford was ordained on the 21st of May, 1845, and on the 28th of July, in the same year, was married to Mary Elizabeth, daughter of Luther and Mary Eaton Stone, of Saxonville, Mass. Then commenced that beautiful life in which the holy ties and responsibilities of pastor, husband, father and friend, were interwoven as God has wisely and mercifully ordained, for personal growth in whatever is purest and most elevated in human character, and for largest communication of good to others. In the bereaved home and in the church of God, that life still exhales a fragrance which seems to come laden with benedictions.

Few spots are more beautiful than Haverhill, rising from the banks of the crystalline Merrimac to the noble heights from which magnificent pictures are spread out on every hand; and few pastors are as happy as Mr. Hosford was, among his generous, affectionate and appreciating flock. He dearly loved the proper duties of the Christian ministry, and discharged all with a peculiar grace, which gave him a constantly increasing hold of the confidence and affections of his people. Comparatively, for a New England parish, his labors were not arduous. Yet his heart seemed always yearning for his Green Mountain home, as the heart of a child yearns for its mother; and his frequent complaints of weariness, bodily and mental, from his Sabbath labors, might suggest a doubt as to whether he should have entered the ministry at all. "Were not Providence somewhat concerned in placing me here," he says, "I should feel like asking for a location where duty would be consistent with delight, and usefulness in my calling be cheered by a daily luxuriating amid the beauties and still more beautiful associations of a mountain home." p. 8. And again after a visit to his native Thetford:

"The fields still smile, never more lovingly, but the hands that once tilled them are dust. The brook still murmurs its sweet soothing music across the farm, but the more musical voices of those who used to play with him [me] along its willowy banks or among its smooth pebbles are silent forever. Under the same shady trees where he and his schoolmates played, and around the same

cool spring where he and they knelt to drink, other merry children drink and sing, who perhaps never heard the name of the stranger who stands weeping at the sight." pp. 9, 10.

When only thirty two years of age he had a presentiment of an early death, and even fancied that he might be gazing for the last time on the beautiful hills of his beloved Thetford. Almost from week to week, we find in his Journal such entries as the following :

"Monday eve. Nervous and sensitive to-day, as is quite common, from the excitement of yesterday. It consumes my life, I am quite confident, and yet 'tis not without its advantages. What a luxury it is to read good poetry in such a frame! Coleridge's Hymn and Apostrophe to Mont Blanc wellnigh overcame me. This may be considered as one of the prerequisites of my calling, perhaps not too dearly bought by the deadness that is apt to succeed." pp. 41, 42.

His constant longing for that "sweet, green, birdy, flowery country home" of his childhood, and the painful prostration which so frequently came after the services of the Sabbath, were both the result of that exquisite sensibility which constituted one of the sweetest charms of his character, and one of his peculiar qualifications for the work of the ministry. Exquisite sensibility can not be, without exquisite suffering. He understood this law and was content. When he had been especially happy in the services of the sanctuary, had poured out all the fulness of his heart to God in intercession for his flock, and to that beloved flock in preaching, there would ensue, when night had closed around, and he sat with only his family and his books about him, and the heavy burden of care was lifted from his soul, a condition in which all the faculties of his understanding, and every affection of his heart was quickened to an unwonted activity. Then the great Christian poets afforded him unutterable delight, and he seemed to penetrate, almost with the vision of a seer, the profound mysteries of the Faith. As all disposition to sleep was far from him, he would linger often by the hearth-stone quite into the small hours of the night, taking no note of time, giving full play to thought and fancy and feeling, and beyond measure happy in his own soul and in the dear society of her in whom all his soul found truest ap-

preciation and tenderest sympathy. He was accustomed to say that he found a full equivalent for all the suffering which his sensitive nature caused him, in the high enjoyment which came to him through the same channel; and that, while it distressed him much to think that his children should suffer when he was gone, yet, balancing one thing with another, he was more than willing that they should resemble their father in this respect.

His delicate and highly nervous physical organization and the weakness induced by impaired health, had, doubtless, not a little to do with the peculiar sufferings of which we have spoken, and many others to which he was subject through the whole course of his pastoral life; and yet, of all earthly callings that, beyond the shadow of a doubt, was the one best suited to him, not more when considered with reference to his usefulness, than to his truest present happiness, and length of days on earth. That his days were prolonged by his studies and labors in the Christian ministry, is a conclusion which all the data, as we judge, would go to establish; and that, with all the abatements in his case, he was one of the happiest, most joyous men, diffusing sunlight wherever he came, they who knew him best will bear witness. When one of a band of brothers has been suffered to leave his father's farm and go to college, for the reason that he, of all his father's sons has not the physical strength to do a full day's work on that farm, and has entered the ministry and toiled hard in it for half a century, and has outlived every one of those stronger brothers, and has still been full of energy and intelligence at fourscore, he has simply supplied an illustration of well-known laws. The student lives longer than other men. All the professions are abundant in very remarkable illustrations. Among the liberal vocations, the clerical is decidedly most favorable to longevity, as statistics clearly show. Partly, and, as we believe, in large part, this is owing to the fact that, of all earthly callings, no other is so happy as that of the faithful minister of Jesus Christ. Happy, we mean, in the sense that it embraces the conditions on which a man's peace and contentment and joy do most largely depend.

We speak what we do know in this matter. It happened to us to be counted in a numerous family of brothers and sisters,

whose father was a poor country minister. A new garment was a most important event, from childhood upward, and a new school book was a prize which glittered in our view as few things have glittered since. We have likewise had lengthened experience ourself in the pastorate, and have fought with beasts at Ephesus. And now, looking back over all, from a point in the journey at which human judgments are supposed to be sober and deliberate and matured, our very decided testimony is, that if the journey were to be commenced by us once more, we would willingly be the son of just such a father of a numerous family; that we would choose the Christian ministry in preference to any other earthly vocation, and, if we had ten sons and seven daughters, we would rejoice exceedingly to have them all ministers, or the wives of ministers.

That Mr. Hosford completed his appointed time on earth, and accomplished his appointed service for the Master, we know. That his life, though not long, and in spite of bodily weakness which would have conquered other men, and kept them out of the ranks altogether, was beautiful and brave, a picture in which joyous sunbeams struggled everywhere with deep shadows, a garden by whose bright flowers, and fragrance, and precious fruits, many hearts were made glad, this most fitting Memorial shows. His richest graces were so closely blended with God's fatherly chastening in that hopeless and ever increasing weakness, that one is afraid to wish anything changed, lest the wish should savor of irreverence for God, who, we must believe, finds a pleasure worthy of himself in fashioning the plan of every good man's life. It is an unspeakable relief to the sympathy which his sufferings awaken, and the deep sorrow caused by his death, to think how all his sufferings wrought in him, through the divine mercy, to fit him for heaven, and how beautiful and happy he must have been on his first entrance there. If we could believe fully, and remember, that heaven, and not this sin-stricken and blighted earth, is the scene of Christ's completed triumphs, and that his people are kept here chiefly that they may be prepared for translation, in a glorious perfection, to the mansions he is preparing for them there, many of our judgments would be reversed, as regards their temporal condition. We are not more than half

believers as to the things in which true blessedness consists. Few are quite willing to walk with Christ in his pilgrimage of sorrow, not considering that for us, as well as for him, that is the appointed path to the heavenly felicities, the crown of glory. There is another view of the subject which deserves to be deeply pondered. The minister of Jesus Christ suffers for others. It is an indispensable part of his qualifications for his work. "And whether we be afflicted, it is for your consolation and salvation, which is effectual in the enduring of the same sufferings which we also suffer." In this sense, whoever will be a faithful pastor enters into the shadows with Christ.

Christ suffered for us in a double sense. He met the divine justice, and satisfied all its claims on our behalf. He suffered the penalty of violated law, thus providing a free justification for sinners, and maintaining the honor of the Divine government. In this stupendous work he stood alone, the Creator of the universe becoming the Redeemer of fallen men. The mightiest angel, all the angels, could not have relieved him of the very smallest particle of that great sorrow and travail of his soul. He must tread that winepress alone. Only God can be a vicarious Saviour. To claim any participation for sinful man, or sinless angels, with Christ in such sufferings, is either to exalt creatures to the throne of God, or to bring God down to a level with creatures. It is most consolatory to remember that there is another view of Christ's sufferings on which the Bible lays much stress, as having a very important relation to his great work, as the Redeemer of his people. He suffered that he might sympathize. He bore with him to heaven, when he ascended, the heart of the "man of sorrows," the same human heart whose unutterable tenderness was poured out in tears at the grave of Lazarus. Thus when we pray in the agony of our grief, we come not to the invisible and incomprehensible Jehovah, clothed in awful majesty, and terrible to us by reason of his pure spiritual nature, but unto the Lord Jesus Christ, who suffered on earth for us, and then for us ascended to the glorious heavens in the same human nature in which he suffered, and there ever lives to intercede for us, and to extend to us a sympathy, in which the remembrance of personal human sorrows is strangely blended with a love and power that are infinite.

In this sense he says to all whom he calls to the ministry of the Gospel: "Ye shall drink of the cup that I drink of, and with the baptism that I am baptized withal shall ye be baptized." The mystery of many a deep sorrow laid upon the faithful servants of Christ has its beautiful solution here. It is appointed and necessary, not only that they guide the footsteps of the flock, but that they bear their sorrows. A momentous responsibility, and a most exalted honor! Who is sufficient? The young pastor, as he stands up in the house of God, and looks upon his charge, of all ages and conditions, and remembers how multiplied and how various, ere many years are past, will be the afflictions in which he, as the faithful shepherd, will be called to bear a part, may well be troubled in spirit as he says within himself: "I have a baptism to be baptized with, in order that I, like the Master, may be prepared to weep with them that weep."

In this view of the life so beautifully presented in the Memoir before us, we are constrained to admit and to glorify the wisdom and the grace of God. The heart of Mr. Hosford was a fountain, a deep, unfathomed well-spring of truest, tenderest sympathy for the sorrows of his flock. There are those in that flock who can not remember his form, his face, his voice, without a tear. "He spoke to us words of tenderness in our affliction, he prayed with us by the bedside of our sick, he sat with us in silence and wept, in the chamber of our dead."

The minister of Jesus Christ bears the sorrows of his people in this sense, and carries their griefs; and for this special work a training is required which the colleges, and schools of the prophets can not give. It is a baptism of suffering. Thus did God himself prepare our brother for his appointed work, imparting a strange charm to his character, and giving to his ministry a power that reached to the lowest depths of his people's hearts.

It was an innate quality, developed and fashioned by his peculiar personal experiences into a fitness for the work he was to do. It is not every good man who can be wrought by the grace of God and much affliction to the pattern of Christ as a friend of the sorrowing. We have seen a man who was singularly true and sincere and kind, but who could not weep with



those who wept ; and when his own beautiful and beloved child died, we marvelled that he seemed to stand in so little need for others to weep with him. Such a man excites confidence, respect, esteem ; but has little power to awaken love. He is not the good man for whom, peradventure, some would even dare to die.

It is a fact worth careful study, that conscience has a much broader, fuller play in a man of strong and tender sympathies. He imputes to himself as grievous sin, sin which causes life-long, bitter sorrow, and which he can never forgive, an act which another would hardly remember. We know a man of brilliant talents, and distinguished reputation in the republic of letters, who declares that he can not remember without harrowing remorse having once, when a boy, made a black girl in his father's house cry by a single act of harshness. Can it be necessary to say, that all his life long his sympathies and his conscience have been prompting him to deeds of generosity which many men who are called good would pronounce foolishness ; just as their ethics would write down that act of harshness to the poor black child as an instance of boyish thoughtlessness, instead of a sin.

A touching incident in the life of Mr. Hosford illustrates the same law. When he was a boy an elder sister whom he tenderly loved came home to die of consumption. It was a cold December, and a part of Frank's daily duty was to bring in at night the wood to keep the sick chamber warm. Once, when his coasting or skating had suffered some abridgment or interruption, he was betrayed into an expression of impatience and fretfulness in his sick sister's hearing, which his mother noticed, and said to him in a low voice : "You wont have to bring in wood much longer for poor Lucy !" The next Sabbath evening he was called into the room to see her die. Seventeen years after he wrote : "That one act has cost me more sorrow than any other act of my life. It seems as if God punished me every day for it ; for every day I think of it, and it makes me unhappy." pp. 2—5.

That the severity of his self-judgment was according to truth, we believe, as we believe that out of it God made to spring a rich and abundant harvest of tenderness and sympathy and

tears for the sick and sorrowful, through the whole course of his beautiful life. How gentle and loving and full of solace his pastoral attentions must have been, is made plain by his own frequent reference to the afflictions of his people. At the funeral of a little child,

"I was impressed," he says, "with the idea of the great amount of joy that Christian hope has distilled from tears, and the many beautiful things (like flowers) that have sprung up from the graves of children. Verily Christianity sheds a light on little graves." p. 37. Again, "To have come to this scene from the sick-bed of an aged person whom I could address only through a trumpet; and then to hurry from it to the funeral of a poor colored girl, who had died homeless and friendless, but who in her last hours, expressed a desire to see her brothers, who were, she knew not where, only that they were far off amid the sorrows of slavery; and then to go from this last to the funeral of a little child;—this has made out a day's labor, which, if it could impress others to whom I ministered as deeply as it has worn into my own body and mind, would be a day long to be remembered." pp. 39, 40.

It was twelve years later, and when he was drawing very near the promised land, that the great sorrow of his life fell upon him, in the death of his darling child, "little Mattie." With a crushed and bleeding heart he laid her in the grave, and two years later his own worn out and wasted frame was laid by her side. It would seem that he hardly needed the terrible discipline of this affliction to qualify him for his work; yet he was not suffered to lay down his burdens until it had borne very precious fruits. To friends under a like visitation he wrote:

"You will now understand, better than before, the depth of my affliction; and will not think it so strange that it should follow me so long, with a freshness ever new. U——'s bursting out into loud cryings when he came unexpectedly upon little Frederick's hat, some months after his decease, is reenacted here almost every day of our lives; and not unlikely you will also learn what this is, and what it means. Oh, to have such a shadow settling over everything earthly, all relishes so deadened, all ambitions so tempered down, all joys so modified; and to have all these great effects flow from the death of a little child, it shows what mysterious possibilities we are living among, and what powers of joy or sorrow we are bearing

about in these souls, oftentimes without knowing or suspecting it! Poor little Arthur's suffering seems to have been worse than Mattie's, unless the disease paralyzed his sensibilities in part. Oh, her great, cool eyes looking up to us with more than human understanding, and silently pleading for that breath which we could not give! I pray I may never be compelled to witness it or its like again. But I need not tell you this, which, in its substantial elements of sorrow, is so like what you have passed through. I trust the deep baptism of grief, (and you can now see how grief for a child may be deeper than any other, or at least tenderer, for love goes downward rather than upward;) I trust these recent, and to us new griefs, will help us in the higher experiences of the Christian life. We ought now to find it easier to live unworldly and unselfishly, and easier to leave the world when our turn comes. The invisible world is much more a reality, and a nearer and much more precious reality, now that I have such a personal treasure in it. Indeed it does seem very near to me, since I daily talk with one in it, really in it, conscious and blessed, though I see her not with the bodily eye. . . .

"And now, having lived over my afflictions anew in this fresh outgoing of sympathy for you at home, I turn away to other duties.

"Much of the little flesh that was clinging to my bones has been dissolved by the corrosion of silent grief, wearing upon it night and day. Still I work on with a secret conviction that I shall not bear up under it many years." pp. 161, 2.

The chief design of this overwhelming sorrow was to prepare him for the higher scenes on which he was so soon to enter. And here we may note the exceeding tender pity of God, in keeping back that terrible stroke till so near the end. How powerfully it wrought in him toward the accomplishment of the merciful design, is evident. When little Mattie had been lying five months in the grave he wrote to his wife:

"I went this morning to church, but I was thinking most of the time of dear departed Mattie, as I have been, indeed, ever since you left. Oh, how many times of late has the thought of her melted my heart and moistened my eyes. And from her, I turn thought back again to you and the remaining children, and get comfort in the hope and expectation that God will help hold you up by means of them. Oh, how deeply you lie in my heart, so very deep, indeed, as to make few ripples on the surface, so deep that no earthly experiences can shake you out, no, not even the deep experience of death.

"Now, dearest, go on your toilsome, lonely way, cheerfully and rejoicing, and I will try to do the same. The 'Cross Bearer' is my daily counsellor.

"Oh, how deep down it has driven thought and search! How utter the humiliation which it naturally begets! I have recently learned some new things about myself. But must I be utterly bruised and dissolved, in order to know the whole? And if so, can I ever be brought to say, 'As God wills'? Can I look on you and our children, and still say, 'As God wills'?"

"Read the 'Cross Bearer' yesterday, with prayers and tears. Heard fine music in the afternoon. Alas, alas, dear Mattie! Half my life has already gone after her, and the other half remains out of regard to you. May the Heavenly Mercy pity me, and take care of you all." pp. 162, 3.

How great the happiness must be in the enjoyment of which such afflictions seem "light" and "for a moment." That the deepening shadows of his closing years tended to make his "deliverance out of life" a morning of transcendent light and glory, who can doubt; and who would have wished to detain him another day amid the thickening gloom of his sorrows?

We are not quite sure that such a word as "gloom" should be used in connection with his name. Certainly he was never a gloomy or even a sad man. Naturally cheerful as the morning bird, and genial as a summer day, with a charming wit and humor, which all his sufferings only chastened, his pleasant sallies, suggested by his books, the furniture of his sick room, the prescriptions of the doctor, surprised his friends, and softened for a moment the keen edge of their grief, even to the last, like flowers which bloom late into autumn. But, withal, he was a man of a profound Christian faith and a most cheerful piety. His soul rested on Christ as the rock of ages, and basked in his love as in the fulness of noon-day. His deep and overwhelming convictions of personal guilt were the counterpart of the joy unspeakable which he found every day in the hope that Christ's righteousness was imputed to him for justification. All his sorrows and sufferings were, to his serene, unwavering faith, the dispensations of a wisdom that was perfect, and a love that was infinite. He knew that the shadows extended but a little way, and that all beyond was the brightness of eternal day, as the sun shines full and clear on the mountain-tops,

when clouds and tempests lie on the valleys below. His vision reached that perfect day, its glories were the theme of his pleasant song in the house of his pilgrimage. So have we seen at midday, in the dense and tangled forest, whose deep shadows were in sympathy with the awful stillness, a beautiful bird singing a song in which the plaintive and the cheerful were strangely blended, while a single bright sunbeam had made its solitary way through the thick foliage, and was pouring all its sweet light upon the plumage of the little songster, and apparently inspiring its lay.

Few men have so keen a delight as Mr. Hosford had in the many beautiful and precious things which are saved to us out of the primeval wreck. He loved the great, rough mountains, and the smooth, grassy meadows, and rivers and brooks and trees and skies and flowers and birds, with an affection as tender as a little child has for the pleasant things of its home. He sketched them, too, with an exceedingly delicate pencil :

"And then the woods—the old, stately, and historic woods—the cool, mossy, flowery, and sweet-scented woods ; in one part as silent as the place of graves, and in another as social as all heaven's sweet songsters can make them, 'God's first temples,' his latest and his best, in which the worshipper is both awed down and lifted up by an atmosphere of divine presence." p. 93.

How skilfully he turned all to account for the instruction of his flock, those who heard him will not soon forget. Thus in a sermon on the transfiguration :

"A memorable Sabbath in our history was one spent in the Glen at the foot of Mount Washington. Our fellow-worshippers were not of human mould or stature. During all the day clouds and darkness were round about the sovereign mount. The hoary head of the prince of that group was not once visible. We saw him only by the eye of faith. Oh, how deep thoughts concerning him were stirred by the very fact of his being veiled ! A little before sunset the hoary summit broke through its envelope for a few minutes, and then all was mystery again. But soon a rising breeze swept the whole cloud-drapery aside, and there stood the glorious king in serene majesty and beauty. The rain had so washed the atmosphere from its impurities as to show every outline of the mountain with almost incredible distinctness ; and all this majesty was then flooded in the

golden rays of the setting sun. A sight it was to be remembered through life; yea, death itself can not wipe it out of the memory, save by wiping out the very fabric of the soul. The unusual beauty of that sight was all due indirectly to the preceding clouds.

"So do dark providences screen from clear vision the benevolence of our God. So does this obscurity quicken our inquiring souls to an unusual intensity. So then do the clouds break, and give you a momentary but clear view of the paternal countenance." pp. 89, 90.

Mr. Hosford's love of science would have made him a master in that department if it had been his chosen vocation. His literary tastes were various, and, taking into account his conscientious and assiduous devotion to all the duties of his ministerial and pastoral charge, we are no less surprised at the opulence than the severity of his culture. The best poets soothed him in his weariness, and refreshed him like new wine. His powers as a writer made him a most welcome contributor to the leading issues of the periodical press. Whether he wrote for the daily or weekly newspaper, the magazine, or the quarterly review, he was equally at home; nor was it easy to say in which he excelled. He meddled with a wide range of subjects. Natural scenery, science, music, criticism, his country, the great war, theology; on all these he essayed his powers, and left papers on all, in which strength and beauty of thought are embodied in a style of singular transparency, and of a classic elegance.

In sparkling humor, and keen, withering satire, it may be safely affirmed that Mr. Hosford had few equals. These were not things which he sought, or on which he plumed himself, but spontaneous, irrepressible, a part of his very nature, like his tender sympathy, or love of woods and mountains. His wit played forever in delicate coruscations about that which was innocent, while his satire, like a Damascus blade, cut deep into the heart of foolishness and sin. Many of our readers will remember, as instances of the latter, his series of articles upon "Great Sermons," published in the *Boston Recorder* in 1857, and "A New Professor in Old Theology," in the same paper in 1859. The articles on "Great Sermons" were republished in England. A great multitude who never saw Mr. Hosford, but who had derived both instruction and delight from the produc-

tions of "Cecil," sincerely mourned when that genial heart ceased to beat, and that right hand forgot its cunning.

One thing more would seem to have been necessary to complete the beautiful harmony of the character which we have very imperfectly drawn, and Mr. Hosford had it in high degree—a love of music. He was richly endowed by nature in this respect, and his gifts were largely cultivated, so that his whole soul was filled with an intense, unutterable delight in listening to the sublimest compositions of the great masters. How he should have found time, need excite no more surprise than that the towering pine tree finds time to be aromatic, or to sigh in the wind, as well as to be beautiful and strong. It was a part of his nature, and a constant growth through all his years from the time when he used to climb upon his father's knee in Thetford, to hear him sing "Thousands of thousands," and his mother charmed the little ones by singing plaintive airs and simple ballads at her little wheel and loom, and all in the happy home were made happier by listening to the strains of the *Æolian* harp. As his friends now remember him, what a strange blank would there be in that exquisitely rounded character, if music were left out! It was not a sentiment or a passion, but a healthy appetite of his spiritual nature. Its indulgence brought repose and healing and elevation. His soul was fed on ambrosia. It was his training and growth, in part, for the blissful day when he should stand among the hundred and forty and four thousand on the Mount Zion above. Thus he says :

"I am sure I have struck at the very soul of music. No man could describe, I could not myself, its effect on my highest culture, intellectual and religious. All I can say is, that I have been permitted to enter the 'Holy of Holies,' in this respect, for which I give most humble and hearty thanks. The Bible gives every intimation that music will in some way form part of the worship of heaven. So this preparation of soul will not be lost." p. 104.

This was written, it will be perceived, after his return from a grand musical banquet.

We must speak of Mr. Hosford as a preacher. When he had been more than two years out of the Seminary, and no church had called him to be its pastor, he was troubled in spirit,



and feared, lest, after all, he lacked the necessary qualifications for the high vocation to which he had looked forward with intense desire. But he possessed his soul in patience and in cheerfulness. He was neither broken in spirit nor soured. During the third year of his patient waiting he wrote those genial and sparkling articles which many readers of the *Boston Recorder* still remember, over the signatures respectively of "Luke," "Joseph," and "Mark"; and entitled, "The Unsettled Minister to his Brethren," "A Dream of an Unsettled Minister," and "Hints to Destitute Churches, by an Unsettled Minister." With what a peculiar ability he acquitted himself in the pulpit, there is abundant evidence to show. His biographer has sketched him in a passage as beautiful as it is just:

"Those who have known and appreciated him, are the best judges of his character as God's public ambassador. And it is not too much to say, that, in their estimation, Cowper's familiar and oft-quoted lines are rarely applied with more exact appropriateness to a modern New England preacher than to him. Never did a man more heartily abhor pretension, claptrap, and noisy emptiness in the pulpit than he. Never did a preacher more thoroughly despise the substitution of 'philosophy and vain deceit, and oppositions of science falsely so called,' for the simple Gospel, or the putting of self in the place of Christ. Cordially and strongly, as well as intelligently attached to the old doctrines of the Reformation and of the New England Fathers, which, in his inmost heart, he believed to be the doctrines of Paul, and, better than all, of Christ, he never swerved in defending them against all attacks and all threatening dangers on the right hand and on the left. Yet he never did this roughly nor coarsely. He was always the gentleman, as well as the ambassador of God, both in the pulpit and out of it. Simple, yet original; quiet, yet often very striking; earnest, yet ever kind; keen, yet always delicate and dignified; pointed, yet never rudely personal, his sermons were deeply impressive, and always full of useful and serious practical lessons." pp. 70, 71.

It was in the pulpit, above all other places, that Mr. Hosford desired to excel, and to his weekly preparations for the pulpit the best of his strength and his most patient, earnest efforts were given. To this all other pursuits, however highly valued, were strictly subordinate in his view and in his conduct. How well the variety and affluence of his gifts and attainments contributed

to breadth of treatment and beauty of illustration and strength of argument and force of appeal in his preaching, they can best bear witness who listened year after year to his voice, with an ever increasing interest and profit, and with a not infrequent astonishment at the rich abundance of the "things new and old" which he brought forth. That there would be "beauty and tenderness in his language, when speaking of the future world, of heaven as the home and rest of believers, and the consummation of the interrupted joys and plans of this life," it is easy to believe.

"Who that has heard him often can not recall the light which shone from his eyes, and the meaning which animated his tones, as he dwelt upon these lofty themes? On such occasions we felt lifted above the level of our wonted experience on the wings of his faith and spirituality, and permitted for a time to breathe the air of the heavenly city." p. 73.

The Memoir informs us that he "particularly excelled" in "the tenderness and apposite beauty of his illustrations of truth," yet never knew it, and was always longing to possess the gift. (pp. 73, 4.) There was another remarkable power as a preacher which he possessed in a high degree without being at all conscious of it, and that was the power of extemporaneous speaking. He dared not attempt it on the Sabbath, but in the lecture-room on a week evening, when he had well digested some grand theme, and had arranged the things he wanted to say upon it, and his own heart and soul were filled with it, and he surrendered himself without fear to the strong current of his thoughts and emotions, he soared to heights of eloquence which surpassed his best written efforts. We state this on the testimony of a competent critic, a very intelligent member of Mr. Hosford's church. We are reminded to say here; that we had hoped ere now to see the announcement of a volume of Mr. Hosford's Sermons and Essays. Such a volume would possess an interest and value quite beyond the circle of those whose happiness it was to know him personally, as pastor or friend. There was another rich gift for the pulpit in which our brother was preëminent, and that was the gift of prayer. Many who heard him in public and on private occa-

sions, have testified that few men prayed as he prayed. Says Professor Shedd :

“The prayers of a Christian man, when he is in a praying mood, reveal his inward nature and traits more than any other mental productions. Those of Mr. Hosford were oftentimes strangely searching and intensely supplicatory. When under the strong impression of eternal realities, his petitions reached a sphere that was wholly unearthly. I remember, and shall always remember, a prayer which he offered beside the open grave of the late Dr. Dimmick. We had followed his remains, as a clerical association, to their last resting place in the cemetery, and with us were the weeping kindred, the weeping parishioners, and the saddened townsmen. Mr. Hosford was called to give voice to the reflections and emotions of the hour. His own mind had been deeply smitten by the very sudden death of a most respected and beloved father in Christ : and there rose from his burdened but confidently believing soul such a supplication as lifted, and strengthened, and comforted us all. Once again, in the privacy of his own home, and under the anguish of a bereavement that seemed to tear away a part of his own heart, I heard him offer a prayer that was awful for its spirituality, its resignation, and its rooted trust in God.” pp. 257, 8.

Mr. Hosford was dismissed from his pastoral charge, in compliance with his own request, on the twenty sixth day of October, 1863, when it had become only too plain to himself and the sorrowing flock, that God had already brought his labors in the ministry to their appointed close, through the hopeless failure of his health. In less than ten months from that day the Saviour came and received him unto himself, when he had calmly spoken words of benediction and tender farewell to all, had, with an unclouded mind, according to his own earnest wish and prayer, borne his last emphatic testimony to the divine love and faithfulness, and endured as seeing Him who is invisible, in the fearful agony of dissolution. He died the tenth of August, 1864, in the forty seventh year of his age. “On the southern slope of an embowered hill, from which there is a charming view of the Merrimac,” our dear brother sleeps. “Little Mattie” is sleeping by his side. He had chosen it for her place of rest, and, may we not believe? hardly less for his own.

The monumental stone bears the following inscription :

“ BENJAMIN FRANKLIN HOSFORD,  
For Twenty Two Years a  
Minister of Christ.

Born November 11, 1817 ; Died August 10, 1864.

‘ I know in whom I have Believed. ’ ”

The storms of three winters have swept over his grave, and the early birds and flowers of the third summer are already disappearing from the magnificent landscape which lies around that peaceful “ city of the dead ” ; but many years must come and go before that hallowed spot will cease to draw the footsteps of those who remember the words which he spake while he was yet with them, and to move their tears.

And now we have to ask pardon of Mr. Hosford’s friends for having had the temerity to attempt what we have so inadequately performed. Our portraiture is not for them. We have felt that such poor tribute as we could pay was due to our affectionate homage for one of the most beautiful characters we have ever known, and who, in addition to delightful personal fellowship, stood to this *Review* in the relation of one of its ablest and most valued contributors. We are content to occupy a humble position among those who bring flowers to deck his grave. It is most pleasant to think how little our services are required. This unique and singularly elegant volume is a fitting and graceful expression of love. Its reception was an agreeable surprise. Who could doubt that it was another fruit of that quadruple alliance of “ brotherly kindness ” to which we have already made allusion. In the manufactory of one of the parties the paper, so exquisite in texture and thickness and ample size, was prepared expressly for this Memorial. Let it be received as a part of the tribute due to the beloved name of Benjamin Franklin Hosford, if we write along with his, the names of Hale, Nichols, Tyler and Warren, the four friends whose hearts the transcendent beauty of his character moved to deeds of such generous benefaction.

## ARTICLE VII.

## MODERN PAGAN WRITERS.

*History of the Rise and Influence of the Spirit of Rationalism in Europe.* By W. E. H. LECKY, M. A.

*The Radical.*

*North American Review.*

*Christian Examiner.*

*Atlantic Monthly.*

WE could never think of being so tedious to our readers as to give a very long list of the modern pagan writers; we instance the above as affording curious illustrations for those whose business it is to know the depravity of man. We have specially to do with Mr. Lecky's book, intending to take note of the spirit of the writer, his historical prejudices, and the effect of the book; illustrating our remarks by reference to the other writers named. Mr. Lecky's assault on the Christian doctrines, his attempt to divorce morality and doctrine, and his substitute for doctrine, may be suitably taken up in the same manner at some future time.

This work has been now for a considerable time before the public; long enough to find many readers among those curious in such literature. The copies in public libraries are well worn. The book is an attempt to prove that all the improvements in modern society came about through secular forces and, in the main, in opposition to Christianity. This secular movement is called rationalism; "a secular, that is to say, a rationalistic standard." We suppose that this was the definition Mr. Lecky had in mind when he called his book a History of Rationalism. This differs from the orthodox use of the word, which represents rationalism as the secular spirit in its opposition to Christianity. Mr. Lecky treats of the secular spirit in general, taking the best things he finds in history, and asserting that they are the fruit of rationalism; he shows indeed how this spirit has opposed Christian errors and doctrine, and he claims that the secular spirit is the true Christianity. Taking the word ration-

alism in its orthodox use, Mr. Lecky has not written a history of rationalism; he has written a book in which he cites certain historical facts to sustain certain theories calculated to undermine the Christian doctrines, and he has called this a *History of Rationalism*.

There is something very vague about Mr. Lecky's use of terms, which indicates an inexperience in close writing. "The spirit of the age." What is it? He uses the phrase: "the guilt of error," but we question a long time before we find out whether he means an intellectual wandering, or the wandering of the will from the path of rectitude; it is by a comparison of several uses of the term that we at last find out. It is certainly a grave error, a serious mistake of the intellect, to prepare so big a book without stating more definitely what the author would be at. The animus of the book can not be mistaken. It is opposed to revelation, and in more than one place it definitely takes the ground that the conscience of man is revelation enough from God. What the author says on page 182 of the first volume (Eng. ed.) is to the point, and in various places he appears to know definitely what rationalism is, and what it is not, in its leading principles. Now this is the position with which he ought to have set out if he meant to give a history of rationalism; here is something definite, easily done. But instead of being thus clear, he is very vague, as indeed he needs to be after pages 18, 19, Introduction, in which he gives altogether a different definition of rationalism, or rather no definition at all. He there denies that rationalism is anything definite in doctrine or criticism; but it is "rather a certain cast of thought, or bias of reasoning, which has, during the last three centuries, gained a marked ascendancy in Europe," and that "the nature of this bias will be exhibited in detail" in the book. Then follows a partial intimation of his real views, that biblical dogmas are subordinate to reason, and that they only indicate the religious wants of the universal race, that conscience is the only moral guide, and that nature accounts for "all kinds of phenomena." All this he calls "a mental tendency," "the spirit of the age."

This vagueness allows the author to put into his book any fact or theory he pleases, baptizing all as "the spirit of the age,"

and calling it that all this is somehow indefinitely connected with the history of rationalism in Europe. Anything that ever happened in Europe can be treated of under the title the spirit of the age; and whenever the author has anything to say that is not connected with the subject announced in his title-page, he intimates that rationalism and the spirit of the age are the same thing, and then goes on to tell his story. This vagueness in the outset allows frequent wandering from the real point in hand, all through the book; or rather the point that ought to be in hand, for the author is sometimes pointless. This vagueness of definition allows frequent misapprehension of the real points at issue. Many and many pages of the book would fall out of it if they were asked how they came there, by an honest proposition put forth in the outset. Is this book a history of the religious, or irreligious movement which has denied the Christian assertion of an infallible written revelation, and which, on the other hand, has asserted the sufficiency of the conscience as a revelation from God? Apply this proposition to the book, and the book would about go to pieces. The paragraphs would leap out in squads. This book is not really the history of rationalism, according to the author's own definition of the term, though this may by some be said to depend on which of the author's definitions we take. This book is not even a "history of a mental tendency" in Europe; it is merely a book which sets forth the mental tendency of the author. In setting forth his own mental tendency he has massed a great many facts, which are more or less classified, and he makes all exhibit his own mental tendency with great clearness. This is the key if you will understand this curious book. It is not worth much as a history of anything in Europe, but it is curious as exhibiting Mr. Lecky's mental peculiarities. We said that the author is sometimes pointless; this is true if we try to find a history of rationalism in the book; but he is always to the point in making known his own infidel wanderings. He has read much; he cites a great many very curious facts; he propounds a great many very curious theories; he makes all bend to one point, incidentally setting forth his intense opposition to the leading doctrines of Christianity, but primarily his intense opposition to the cardinal doctrine of the



plenary inspiration of the Bible. The whole book is designed to overthrow the leading Christian doctrines, and with them the Bible itself.

With such prejudices he has misread the history of Europe, seeing all things darkly through his peculiar glass, and writing what he thinks he has seen. For example: The Reformation under Luther has made modern Europe; without it, the revival of classical learning, the printing press, the discovery of America, and the invention of the steam engine, would have only aided the development of the depravity of man. But Mr. Lecky, looking through his "mental tendency," and affected by his bias of reasoning, thinks that his peculiar cast of thought has made Modern Europe. The book is very curious. It is a psychological curiosity. It is honestly and earnestly written, and it is very plausible. The man evidently believes that rationalism is the saviour of the world; and this view leads him to turn all facts to substantiate his position. It would be difficult on this account to review the book in detail without making another book as large as his; it would take a page of truthful history to offset or upset a page of his singular theorizing. His facts and theories need the modifying presence of other facts which he has left out of sight. Laying aside these peculiarities of the author, the book is well written and entertaining. While he appears to have a subject he does not always stick to it, or he does not know what the vague thing is, and so wanders pleasantly; he does however stick to his obvious object, which is to undermine Christianity.

The assumption of the man is wonderful. Under cover of a quiet and dignified style there is simple boasting. But we are not surprised; this is nothing new; these boasting words, this quiet assumption, this vanity, this self-conceit, are nothing new. We detect at once the family to which Mr. Lecky belongs. Bombast, baptized or unbaptized, is accustomed to attack the Bible and the biblical theology. Paine was a little vulgar. The self-conceit of Mr. Theodore Parker, however, bordered on the sublime; he intimated that he had better thoughts for men than Jesus Christ had. Christ is often patronized by the "most highly cultivated" writers of New England. And if Jesus Christ was a mere man, why not patronize him? And,

while you are about it, why not abolish God? Is there any blasphemy in the thought? "There is no need of the hypothesis of a God," said Laplace. Says Mr. J. Stuart Mill: "We venture to think that a religion may exist without a belief in a God, and that a religion without a God may be, even to Christians, an instructive and profitable object of contemplation." Abolish God, and yet call yourself a Christian? But this is all right, for long ago men called themselves Christians, though they had abolished Christ. If the Lordship of Christ has been scouted as a fetish which Unitarian churches are bound to get rid of, and if the use of the title Lord in that connection is objected to, it is no wonder that they now talk about getting rid of God also. It is said that you can be just as good a Christian whether you believe in God or not. Says the *North American Review* for April:

"We arrive at the conclusion that the nature of religion justly conceived, consists not in the acceptance of any special opinions, such, for example, as those concerning the existence or non-existence of God, nor in the performance of any special acts, such, for instance, as prayer or worship, but in an attitude of the will. . . . But in more exact terms, we may define religion as a man's devotion, that is, the complete assent and concentration of his will, to any object which he acknowledges to have a right to his entire service, and to the supreme control over his life."

That is, the object of his choice, whatever it is, is his god; and his service is true religion. But a man is a god to himself; for this New England writer scorns the notion of any authority above man. "The principle of authority is indeed contrary to the very nature of religion, properly understood"; the writer holds to "the responsibility of every man to himself alone" for the opinions which he may hold. And yet this writer calls himself a Christian, and says that Christ taught "a conception of religion wide enough to embrace the spiritual aspirations and endeavors of mankind."

That is, a religion which will endorse all the religions of the race.

"Such a conception of religion as this is alone consistent with that spiritual liberty, that freedom of thought, which is the prerogative of every individual, and without which religion is but a form of

superstition." "In such a view of religion as that which has now been set forth, theist and atheist, Christian and infidel, find ground for union in mutual charity, confidence and help; for common labor in the endless work to advance mankind in virtue and happiness."

We can not but agree with this singular *North American* writer that "this now seems bad doctrine," and we wonder whether he himself has not "misread the words of Christ." It is a fact that the "theist and atheist" and "infidel" will "find ground for union" with such a Christian as this; the sentence would, however, have been more complete if he had inserted the word "pagan." All the pagans will agree with this writer.

The natural man is in heart a pagan, find him where you will. The highly cultivated heathen Thoreau, sailing on Sunday on Merrimac River, believed in Jupiter as much as he did in Jehovah:

"Jehovah, though with us he has acquired new attributes, is more absolute and unapproachable, but hardly more divine, than Jove. He is not so much of a gentleman, among gods, not so gracious and catholic, he does not exert so intimate and genial an influence on nature, as many a god of the Greeks."

Thoreau calls Jehovah "the almighty mortal, hardly as yet apotheosized"; and adds:

"In my Pantheon, Pan still reigns in his pristine glory, with his ruddy face, his flowing beard, and his shaggy body, his pipe, his crook, his nymph Echo, and his chosen daughter, Iambe; for the great god Pan is not dead, as was rumored."

Is not this paganism? Is it not possible to find Modern Pagan Writers even in New England? There is nothing harsh in applying the term pagan to the "Brahmin class," who make an open boast of pagan sentiments. The development theory finds advocates among "the first scholars" of the age. There is a natural tendency in unrenewed men to fall back into heathenism of a base type. The process is all the time going forward. There are highly cultivated heathen in India. We need not wonder to find them in England or America. The process is gradual. In the first generation the total depravity of a literary man may lead him merely to ridicule his father as an orthodox bigot of very narrow mind; but in the next genera-

tion the son will say: "My father was an ape." A sad ending this for the "three-decker brains" of the "first writers" of New England.

Mr. Lecky has all the marks of this highly cultivated heathen race, though his culture is above the average of the tribe as it appears in America. He resembles them most in his disposition to think more highly of rationalism than he ought to think. Country clowns are not more boastful than the members of the high literary circles of our American rationalism. Mr. Lecky has all the assumption of his class. Not yet given over to the work of doing away with God, he quietly goes through the history of Europe as blind as an atheist. He sees only the development of man, and "the spirit of the age." To him there is no God in history. His eye is blind to the appearance of a kingdom of God in the world. Christianity itself is deemed divine only as one of many religions, one form of the development of the religious nature of man. And all through his book he grandly assumes that rationalism is taking the place once occupied by Christianity. Mr. Parker is the only writer who approaches him in the grand dignity of this assumption. What appears to be a considerable knowledge of history supports his theories. An appearance of fairness, and magnanimous charity, tends to give the reader confidence in the writer as a man of large mind. Does he not take a fair view of the historical field? And is it not the deliberate conviction of this comprehensive mind that Christianity is failing, and that rationalism is coming to occupy its place as a religious power? For example, he asserts that once those forsaking the Roman Catholic church became Protestant, but now they become rationalists, and that "the general current and bias of the intellect of the age is in the direction of rationalism"; and that "there is a strong predisposition to value the spiritual and moral element of Christianity, but to reject dogmatic systems and more especially miraculous narratives"; and that "intellects unshackled by" the "traditions" of "dogmatic Protestantism" "will never embrace" it, and it seems "plausible" that "the current of civilization must ultimately transform or overthrow" it. In all this he sees the rising glory of rationalism with its "sublime synthesis" of "all the past forms of human belief."

But in all this we see only the fact that under the influence of the Protestant movement infidelity is free to have a "continous and uninterrupted development." Men are free to indulge in "the guilt of error." Protestantism has made open, outspoken rationalism possible. Infidelity rose and fought Christianity in the early ages, as soon as there was any Christianity to fight. During the Roman Catholic dominion in Europe, all heretics and infidels were repressed by physical violence if need be; secret infidelity remained secret. And when the Reformation under Luther broke up the Roman Catholic power, infidelity began to work again. The mere frankness which comes of freedom will make it appear that there is more infidelity than once. One half of the Unitarian ministers in America, according to Dr. Bellows, are preachers of infidelity. This handful of preachers have a few adherents. We have a few people in America who really think with Mr. Lecky that the world is all running after rationalism. Preachers who do not believe in an atonement, or in regeneration, readily fall into this rationalistic notion of doing without a Bible altogether. So far as concerns these hundred and fifty Unitarian churches, the movement is more of a success than the infidel worship that was set up in the French Revolution; but this is because these congregations have mostly formed the habit of going to church under the name of Christianity, most of them even now thinking that they are the best Christians in the world. But the number of these infidel teachers is so ridiculously small when compared with the evangelical ministry, that it is evident that the number of infidels is not really greater in proportion to the Christian church than once, though the freedom of the age may make them more outspoken, and by loud boasting it may be made to appear that they have become a great power in the world. This Mr. Lecky has his head so full of this insignificant "modern spirit," that he can hardly discern what the ancient spirit really was. He can see only rationalism in the past. He thinks rationalism has been the great instrument in affording light and hope to Europe. So a fly on a coach wheel knew not what raised the dust, the fly or the wheel, but thought on the whole it was the fly that did it. This Mr. Lecky has become so involved in the "traditions" of unbelief

that he can not even see the grand movements of Christianity. "One conclusion we may most certainly and most safely draw"; "it is that the general current and bias of the intellect of the age is in the direction of" Christianity. Never before has Christianity had such singular power as in this very period in which it has seemed to Mr. Lecky to be powerless. Never before has Christianity exerted so mighty an influence on the nations of men, modifying society, and introducing Christian ethics, thus giving "strength and nourishment" even to rationalism. Never before has Christianity made such conquests as in the present generation. Christian dogmas, as the basis of morality, have made a wonderful advance within the last half century. Men begin to see the truth of the system. Never before has vital godliness, the very spirit of Jesus Christ, been so great a power on the earth as to-day. Regeneration, the submission of the will to God, submission to the guidance of the Holy Ghost; faith in the atonement of Christ; an earnest spirit of self-sacrifice, holiness, love to being; these principles of vital Christianity are the great powers in the world to-day. And if Mr. Lecky can not see it, it is because he is subject to the dogmas of rationalism. It is this delightful unconsciousness, or delightful conceit, of the fly on the coach wheel that makes this *History of Rationalism in Europe* one of the curiosities of literature. The author seems utterly to ignore the Christian stand-point in looking at the history of Europe. He sees Rationalism, and Voltaire, and Hobbes, and the spirit of the age; but the yellow primrose of Christianity on the border of "the great movement," "the moral and intellectual development," is to him only a very yellow primrose; it looks pretty enough, but it makes small show by the side of the great infidel sunflower. Yet there are some very amusing passages in Mr. Lecky's Introduction, in which he utters many beautiful and poetic sentiments concerning the importance of divesting one's self of prejudices, and thoroughly understanding the position which even the enemies of the truth occupy, and seeing things through their eyes; a little more dignified in form, but in spirit not very unlike the noisy pretense of fairness and liberality and freedom from bigotry, put forth by the most bigoted sect in New England.

So much for the spirit of the book, now for the subject matter. How easy to leave out of all account certain facts, and then deny the existence of such facts. So owls have been represented as shutting their eyes in the face of the sun, and hooting: "Where is it?" Mr. Lecky's prejudices have led him utterly to misapprehend, and thus to misstate history.

For example, he takes it for granted that the heathen masses of Europe have been influenced by true Christianity, and then proceeds to imply that the fruits of a heathenish state of society are the fruits of Christianity. But, as a matter of fact, Christianity as a scheme of doctrines and morality has never obtained any great degree of power over the masses of Europe even to this day. There has been a nominal Christianity which has rendered the people better off than the so-called pagan nations, but the true spirit of the Gospel has at no time affected any considerable part of the population. The number who have seemed to understand and obey the Gospel has been greater within three hundred years past, but even now the properly Christian element is small compared with the actual populations of the countries. The history of Europe as a whole before the Reformation and since is a history of total depravity in Europe. Christianity has made some show, but much less than some imagine. Read the history of Europe since the conversion of the Northern nations, and it is a history of men very little under the control of the Gospel. Nations were perhaps called Christian, and so counted in the books; but the bulk of the people were still heathen, practically heathen, unbelievers in the Bible sense, having little of the kind of religion set forth by Christ and by Paul. Even in the height of the Papal power, taking the census of Europe, and going to the people as individuals, it appears that the great part of them were, to all intents and purposes, heathen, not habitually attending religious service, the greater part of the time not even under the direct influence of the priests. They had no religious knowledge to speak of aside from the baptismal formula; and no religious experience beyond being wet in baptism. So long as they confessed at suitable intervals, and paid money to the priests, and were guilty of no heresy, they were not disturbed. There was always a rabble in the towns, and a vast class of



peasantry who, for three hundred days in the year, had no more religion than so many brutes. That this was true of all the people appears all the more clearly since it is to so great an extent true of the present population of Europe. We can not pretend that the lower classes before the Reformation were, to any great extent, under the practical influence of the religion of Christ as it is taught in the New Testament. Among these there must have been much more infidelity than is usually supposed. Superstition and unbelief go hand in hand. Go to heathen countries, even where Christianity has not shaken the superstitions, and intimate acquaintance with the secret life of the people will show a considerable number who are infidels. The depravity of the human heart is such that men will not be practically much affected by religious motives, if they have any scheme of iniquity to carry out. Such practical infidelity is always accompanied by more or less theoretical unbelief, even though little is said about it. If the true history of Europe could be known, it would be found that at almost any given period a great body of infidelity existed in the Roman Catholic church, and that practical heathenism prevailed. Primitive Christianity raised the rank and file of the church. The Reformation began to move the church back to the primitive experience; it began to elevate the masses.

It can not now be shown that the leaders of Europe were much more under the influence of true Christianity than the common people. If many of the leaders had been much better the people would have been elevated. At the Synod of Trosley in the beginning of the tenth century, the bishops said;

“In the churches many are found sunk in the lowest vice, and multitudes almost without number of every sex and order, who, to years of old age, have never obtained so much correct knowledge of the simple faith, as to be able to repeat the words of the confession of faith, or of the Lord’s prayer.”

These were the churches: if there were, besides these, outside barbarians, it does not appear what character they bore. But history abounds in statements concerning the clergy, as men caring “for nothing but horses, flocks of sheep and fields,” and appearing “with the marks of intoxication at the altar.”

There were devoted men among the clergy but the larger part of the priests and people were heathen. In the eleventh century Hildebrand told the Romans, Longobards, Normans, that they were worse than the pagans, and said that the bishops were

“Opposed to everything which serves to promote religion and the cause of God. Casting your eye over the west, south or north, you find scarcely anywhere bishops who have obtained their office regularly, or whose life and conversation corresponds to its requirements, and who are actuated in the discharge of their duties by the love of Christ and not by worldly ambition.”

Take the morals of the monks in Geneva, Germany, Italy and England, before the Reformation, and it appears that most of the so-called religious teachers were shockingly irreligious men. They also knew how false and mean they all were. They knew that the vicar of God was a knave, and that the mother church was the mother of many knaves; though perhaps some deluded themselves with the idea that they were ideal Christians. But the hypocrites were infidels; practical and theoretical infidelity abounded. The dogmas of Christianity had little influence upon the lives of the priesthood.

The working of a purer Christianity for three hundred years has not yet brought the nations of Europe into subjection to the Gospel. In the first century of the Reformation little could be done in eradicating the errors of the masses. The gigantic superstition of witchcraft, and the fearful persecution of heretics, were the offspring of the pagan mind, the offspring of unregenerated man, the offspring of rationalism. Rationalism gets on without a Bible; rationalism believes in following out the passions of the natural man; all Europe was in this sense rationalistic when the persecution of heretics and witches prevailed. Europe despised the Bible and the Bible doctrines, and merely took up the teachings of a so-called church which taught whatever accorded with self-interest. This can be proved beyond all peradventure, that the persecutions which arose under the papal power, and which for a time affected the Protestant church, arose from what is now called rationalism, though the name rationalism was not then used to describe that evil “spirit of the age.” Europe was then what the rationalists

want it to be now, a continent ignorant of the true spirit of the Bible, despising the authority of the Bible, and mindful only of the development of original sin. The early Protestants were so involved in this rationalistic spirit of persecution that they found it difficult to break away. If any Christian writer will go into history with the zeal Mr. Lecky has shown, he can easily make out the case, showing that the precepts which governed the persecuting Roman Catholic church and the precepts of modern rationalism are substantially the same. The substantial unity of error is a tempting theme for thirty years' study and a book. Rationalism and Romanism can be shown walking hand in hand; they agree, rejecting the word of God, and merely developing the evil heart of the natural man. The main difference is that Romanism is a church, while rationalism is trying to become a church. The horrors of the French Revolution exhibit the infidel spirit when it has power; a spirit as fiendish as was ever displayed by the Roman Catholic church. This fiendish spirit is found in the natural man.

Now it is absurd for Mr. Lecky to suppose that the dogmas of the church had really much weight in originating the persecution of heretics or witches. Total depravity did it: the total depravity of all Europe did it: and the church dogmas were only the tools the bad men used. It was convenient to use these dogmas. We know that there were some true Christian men who fell in with all these movements, but it was because they were in these points influenced by "the tendency of the age"; such would naturally urge Christian doctrines to support the infamous practices they thought the Lord endorsed.

In looking at the history of Christianity in Europe, it can not be borne too constantly in mind that the so-called "conversion" of Europe was merely nominal. A king was baptized, therefore all his subjects were baptized and called "Christian," but they were pagans as much as ever. For example: France has never been in any proper sense "converted" to this day. A vast population in France are as truly heathen as the Caffres. Lamartine once said of the French people, that lack of conscience was the fatal defect in the French character which made a permanent French republic impossible. Guizot once said: "The thoughts of this people are not the thoughts of a civilized

race; their imaginations are those of a savage tribe." This is true of vast numbers in all Europe. Dr. Arnold called special attention to this mere nominal conversion of the nations as an explanation of the present state of Europe. The Roman church accommodated Christianity to heathen ideas, and then called the heathen "Christians." So the *North American Review* calls its heathenish ideas of religion by the name "Christian." Said Andrew Fuller of the Jesuit missions in China: "They had a great many converts such as they were; but thinking people looked upon the missionaries as more converted to heathenism than the heathen to Christianity." So "liberal" Christians, in despair of bringing men over to them, at last conclude to go over to men, and accommodate their religion to "theist and atheist," "infidel" and pagan; but would not the sharp-eyed Andrew Fuller question whether the *North American Review* is not "converted to heathenism"?

But now we come to inquire how the most gigantic vices of the papal pagans in Europe were removed. Mr. Lecky implies that rationalism broke up the persecution of heretics and witches, and gave rise to the grand commercial, intellectual, and moral movements of modern Europe. His theories show a wonderful perversion of a really remarkable inventive spirit. The revival of letters, the religious reformation, the grand discoveries of printing and the mariner's compass and of America, and the rise of commerce, were remarkable movements. Mr. Lecky takes all these things into account, and calls all "the spirit of the age," and uses this as synonym of rationalism; and says that rationalism, "the spirit of the age," broke up superstitions, witchcraft, religious persecutions and torture. The religious reformation was a rationalistic creation: "The reformation was created and pervaded by the modern spirit." This is the way it is made out: The revival of letters, the study of the Latin classics in the twelfth century, and the fall of Constantinople and the diffusion of the knowledge of the Greek classics and the Platonic philosophy, gave students something to think about and broke up the nightmare under which they had been sleeping in the dark ages; the intellectual habits of Europe were changed, and hence the religious feeling changed; and after that Europe was divided between the Roman Catholics, the

Protestants and the rationalists, the determining causes of the locality of each faith being found in political, social and geographical causes. Mr. Lecky evidently thinks that the revival of learning did really more for Europe than the revival of religion; or, at the least, he vastly overestimates the value of the new-born zeal in the study of the classics. As a matter of fact there was no vital or redeeming power in it. It indeed brought the ancient history face to face with the romantic legends which had taken the place of verities; but its only real service was in promoting philological study, as a preparation for the study of the Bible in the original. The knowledge of the ancient nations brought to light did not rouse the best part of man's nature; it did not result in more profound thinking; and the shallow students were content to imitate the old heathen in their immoralities as well as in their literary culture. The revival of learning did not result in anything very useful till Erasmus turned men's attention to the study of the Scriptures in the original tongues. It was the opening of the Bible which reformed Europe. Mr. Lecky sees the classics and Plato, and the tendency of the age, and the development of blind society, guided by "many special political or social, or even geographical considerations"; but he takes no knowledge of the prayers of "the friends of God," no knowledge of the appearance of the Bible in the common tongue rousing the masses like a new revelation fresh from heaven. He does not see that the revival of learning was only a preparation for the study of the Bible in the original, and that the study of the Bible renovated Europe, and that the discoveries of printing and of the mariner's compass and of America, and the rise of commerce, were only grand servants raised up by Providence to aid the Bible in its work. Not till within three hundred years has the world had a Bible. Before the flood, and for more than eight centuries after, men tried this experiment which Mr. Lecky would have tried again, a world without a Bible. Then the Bible was sixteen hundred years making. Then it worked a few years on a few people. Then for hundreds of years a few thinking men studied the Bible more or less, and learned something of its doctrines; but the masses knew nothing of it: men were left to try the experiment of having a church without a

Bible; and it appeared that a church without a Bible was little better than no church. About three hundred years ago, the Bible began its great career in reforming and saving the world. The printing press and the rise of a new hemisphere, the rise of learning and the rise of commerce, waited on the Bible. Mr. Lecky evidently understands nothing of this. He does not know that the Bible has been a great reforming power, awakening a spirit of inquiry, stirring the minds of common men in the common life, rousing enterprise and love of freedom, and leading men to shake off superstition like a cloak. Mr. Lecky does not understand it. He can understand that Voltaire and Hobbes were influential writers; he can understand that mediæval priests had evil dogmas and led evil lives; but he can not understand that the diffusion of the Bible among the common people had any great influence in renewing the character of society. He can never know just how modern civil liberty came about. He can understand the influence of the contests in the fifteenth century between general councils and the papal authority, and the influence of the ancient classics on a few minds in awakening a love of freedom; but he does not appear to know how the multitude of Bible readers were agitated by the teaching of this book, and how far the conflict for religious freedom aided in gaining civil liberty. A large part of the history of Europe he knows nothing about. The religious reformation, a reformation based solely on the Bible, is the source of the best part of the civilization of modern Europe; and yet Mr. Lecky appears to know little about it, save that one Servetus died at the stake, and certain Scotch ministers believed in witchcraft. He gives, however, some credit on the score of civil liberty.

It is not common for the enemies of the Bible to give the reformers the credit that is due for the work they did in establishing the inductive method of philosophy, which has done so much toward making modern Europe. It is not needful to ask whether Bacon learned the inductive method of Luther. But the fact is that Luther applied the inductive method to theology before Bacon applied it to science; the method was tried on God's written revelation before it was tried on his revelation in nature. To the religious reformers belongs the honor of intro-

ducing the inductive method. They were the first to make it a power in the world. It is true that individuals had suggested this method before, as all great inventions have been heralded by solitary and powerless prophets; but the reformers discovered the method all new, and used it till a new era rose on the world. The early church studied the Bible and drew life from it; but the Papacy nominally relied on the fathers and on church authority, though really relying on the ingenious spirit of base men in the church; so that when Luther and Calvin and Zuingle and Knox succeeded in reëstablishing the church on the Bible, deciding all questions of doctrine and polity and morality by the inductive study of the word of God, and when men began to push the process, and especially when the printed word began to move through the world so that men could study the Bible inductively and know for a certainty the mind of God, then rose a new era in the world. Now when we take into account the different causes which have operated upon Europe in forming modern society, and especially in making modern England, which is the best part of Europe, we find that the work of Luther, Zuingle, Calvin and Knox, has done more to make all that is worth having in modern Europe than any other operative power. Religious and civil freedom, without which inventive and intellectual life can never attain the highest development, arose directly in connection with the work of the reformers; that is, the work of the reformers was the foundation. Take England, and it may be further affirmed that the influence of the Bible has been felt all through the work of building on this biblical foundation, and that if this influence were now withdrawn it would be like taking down the national structure and then taking the bottom out. Without the Bible, England would literally fall through into China; that is, become like China. Our Christian civilization is not a mere natural wisdom springing from the experience of the natural man. Asia and Africa and the isles of the sea also have an experience of forty centuries since the flood; why do not they also have "political economy" and all the modern improvements? Have the Hottentots improved any for centuries? This writer, Mr. Lecky, is only one of many, still half pagan in spirit, who are sighing to get loose from the influence of the



Bible, and who want to try over again the old heathen experiment of a natural development of "the spirit of the age." Why do they not all go to China or India or Africa, and "develop"? They want to get along without a Bible; and there are countries enough where there is no Bible. With all the world before them, why do they stay in Old England and in New England, where the Bible has the most power? If they are philosophers very earnest to improve the world, why do they not develop in a savage country, and create a "spirit of the age" in some heathen nation? Why do they leave all this civilizing work to the friends of the Bible?

But we can not close this part of our subject without alluding to that other great religious reformation in which our rationalistic friends appear ambitious to figure so largely. If we may believe Mr. Lecky and kindred writers, we are now just entering on a new era. Rationalism is held to be a power which will bring in a reform more glorious than that three hundred years ago. Is not this the beginning of a higher and nobler Christianity, a Christianity with all the doctrines left out? Dr. Bellows, in the *Christian Examiner*, November, 1866, announces that the Unitarian church is the grand reforming party engaged in "the great work of correction and purification of the common faith of the church." All who go with them will soon take "a vast step onward and upward." This is the step "which the moral and spiritual interests of humanity wait for and sorely need." Some of our kind country pastors, who have been steadily minding their parish cares, and who have never thought of looking into the *Christian Examiner* and *The Radical*, and who have rarely looked into the *Atlantic Monthly* as into a glass to see how vicious and bigoted they are; these poor, innocent, maligned men have very little idea of the storm that is gathering about their heads. But there is to be another Reformation. Our modern Protestantism is to be swept away. We are on the eve of a great movement. Do we not have heroes all around us? There are men who are trying to do more than Luther and Calvin did. The Unitarian church discovered some years ago that the world had been mistaken for at least "fifteen centuries," in regard to the character of Christ. They are now fully bent on making the most of this

discovery. They have a mission to rectify this mistake. They have given notice that they mean to do it. They have raised a hundred thousand dollars, and they have had several respectable sermons in a Boston theatre. The great movement has begun. All Christendom is on tip-toe. In the language of Mr. Hepworth: "We are on the threshold of a new and fresh commencement." These reformers claim (*Christian Examiner*, Nov. 1866,) that "the fundamental Unitarian protest, denying the deity of Jesus Christ" is a "revolution" of a "radical character." This is true, for if their position is correct all who believe in the deity of Christ are idolators; we are the pagans if Unitarianism is true, and we need not wonder if they look upon us as we look upon them. The "Unitarian protest" is "radical." "No such other step remains to be taken in Christian theology as Unitarianism took. It can not be exaggerated in height and depth." To deny the deity of Jesus Christ is

"To deny the fundamental idea on which the theology of the Christian church has rested since the fourth century, is to dig up the very corner-stone and to undermine the whole structure of the popular theology, both of the Catholic and the Protestant church, for fifteen centuries. If that denial be made good, and successfully established, the very key of the church position and creed is taken; and it is only a question of time, when every other characteristic dogma of what has called itself Orthodoxy so long must be formally surrendered or silently abandoned as untenable."

The Unitarian body has surely begun a great reformation. Its mission is to "undermine the whole structure of the popular theology." It has begun by an attack on "the very key of the church position and creed." Dr. Bellows and Rev. O. B. Frothingham and Rev. Theodore Parker are the true successors of Channing; they are only following up the attack. If Christ is not God then the whole Christian system falls. Buckle, Lecky, Schenkel, Renan and Strauss, are all fellow-helpers with our Unitarian friends. Whoever tries to "undermine the whole structure of the popular theology" is a fellow-helper of the Unitarian "church." The great No-church is invited to prove that the Christian dogma of the deity of Christ was a fable of "the fourth century"; and that the Gospels were composed of exaggerated legends, and that they were not

written by eye-witnesses, by the men whose names they bear, or written at the time commonly pretended. Every shallow author who will venture to attack the received faith is heralded in the Unitarian press as a profound student. The learning of the world is said to be overthrown in an hour by most puerile and inconsistent theories put forth by men thoughtless and unlearned, or by men who have gone to work to study the facts with their minds all made up as to what the facts should be made to prove. These men are all engaged in the great religious reformation of the nineteenth century. They aim at first to tear away the Christian doctrines. The next logical step after this will be the overthrow of Christian morality. It is true that many of these reformers make a great cry in regard to morals; but their morality rejects the authority of the Bible. They have no infallible standard of morality; they leave every man free to be "moral" after his own peculiar style. They leave it to every man to do as he pleases; and there are enough already who assert that no conduct is seriously displeasing to God; and they will soon go over to the ground of denying the distinction between right and wrong, some, in fact, standing there now. Dr. Bellows (*Christian Examiner*, Nov., 1866) fears this as one of the effects of the overthrow of the doctrine of the incarnation. He fears that amid the "general scepticism" there will be "a disposition to deny" the "moral and spiritual authority" of Christianity.

This, then, is the great reformation of the nineteenth century. The reformers look upon the Protestant church as Luther and Calvin looked upon the papal power. Dr. Bellows (*Christian Examiner*, Nov., 1866) says that "transubstantiation and the worship of Mary, or the worship of images," and "the Athanasian and Nicene creeds and the worship of Christ," "are mere degrees of the same kind of superstition." "That same spirit which later made the mother of our Lord an object of Catholic idolatry, earlier made her holy son an object of divine worship." The *Christian Examiner* looks on the Protestant church as the Protestant looks on the Catholic. The incarnation is "as essentially incredible, absurd and self-contradictory a proposition as the human mind, in its wildest flights of religious fancy, ever imagined." This hideous doc-

trine is represented as standing in the way of the progress of the race. The incarnation is set forth as merely a "mythical dogma" united with "the worship of the Virgin," and attracting "the faith of the common people in superstitious times." It is declared that "the time has come when Christian faith staggers under the load of this venerable assumption; when the Gospel is hampered and hindered by its supposed responsibility for such an hypothesis." Mr. Lecky's book is an attempt to show how these Christian doctrines have hindered the progress of the race, and how they have caused all that has been horrible in Europe for hundreds of years. Even Dr. Holmes must put in his little pen and tells silly stories about immoral Orthodox ministers. The fact is that the world has stood Orthodoxy about as long as it can, and now there is to be a "great reformation."

We can not but admire the spirit of these reformers. Some of them have been out West; they think that it is a goodly land in which to sow their seed. They are talking about missions. Already some of them begin to despise the petty and self-satisfied spirit of what *The Radical* calls The Hundred Thousand Dollar Broad Church. Mr. Hepworth describes the Unitarian church as "horridly respectable," "folding their arms over their littleness and their stinginess." "We have lived in the frigid zone." "We have been cold, unsympathizing and terribly stingy." Our Unitarian friends are talking about receiving the Methodists to their fold. But we fear that if the Methodist brethren had been present in Music Hall to hear Mr. Hepworth tell these truths, there would have been a general "Amen" all over the house. If Mr. Hepworth had added that as a denomination they lacked "piety," in the Methodist sense, and lacked a creed, he might have accounted for part of the lack of spirit in the denomination. Their Methodist friends, whom they hope to win over, will tell them that men who never "experience religion," and who do not believe anything in particular, are not the men to promote missions. Dr. R. L. Collier, the Unitarian convert from Methodism, who retains much of his Methodist fire, and we trust no small share of his Methodist religion, says that if the Unitarian denomination is not now ready to enter on a new movement, it is

because it is "not quite dead enough to have a real resurrection." We gladly confess, however, that we are pleased with any signs of a revival of religion in the conservative part of the Unitarian church. An infidel said of the public meeting of the American Unitarian Association in Music Hall in Anniversary Week, that it was "like a Methodist meeting," or a meeting of some other evangelical denomination. Orthodox clergymen present certainly rejoiced to hear so much plain truth well put. Said Dr. Collier: "We mean now more than the Orthodox dream of. We mean to take the world and convert it to primitive Christianity." We say, Amen. He advised the Unitarian denomination to leave theological discussion and go to work to "save the lost." While we noticed more of a sectarian spirit in the Unitarian meetings of Anniversary Week than we found among the Orthodox, we were made glad by hearing some earnest words well spoken for the honor of Christ and the salvation of man. It was said that many of our Methodist brethren are about going over to Unitarianism; but we earnestly pray that the conservative Unitarians may go over to the Methodists. The only salvation for a dying church is found in an unselfish life. Let the conservative Unitarians give themselves thoroughly to earnest missionary work, not to propagate a sect, but to save the perishing, and they will find new life as a body of Christians; though they can never hold what they gain till they have a Christian creed recognizing the word of God as infallible, and confessing man's need of a divine redemption. Our Unitarian friends have little idea of the intense earnestness of the Orthodox church in its work to save the fallen. While the Unitarians are self-complacently talking about "infant damnation," the evangelical churches are quietly sending the Gospel all over the world. There are so many Christian men in the Unitarian ranks that we can not but hope that there will be a re-formation in that body. Unquestionably within a little time the conservatives must enter on Christian missionary work in earnest, and draw nearer to the evangelical denominations, or the denomination, as such, will go over to mere deism. The beginning of the end has come, unless the Christian men in the denomination rise and make a new beginning on a more thoroughly Christian basis. The logical ten-

dency of Unitarian teaching is now appearing. The greater part of the denomination is now going over to open infidelity. Many of them will still call themselves Unitarians, and will still make it appear that Unitarian and infidel are synonyms; but many will reject even the name Christian, and call Christ Leader, not Lord; and some will even reject the leadership of Christ, and follow the pagans.

Twenty years ago Mr. Parker wrote concerning Unitarian anniversaries: "The Unitarians are getting shockingly bigoted and little; their late meetings were windy, and they meet to ventilate their narrowness; yet how contemptible must be a sect who only deny the divinity of Christ, affirming a denial, their life the development of a negation!" But if Mr. Parker had lived in this year of grace 1867, he would have been gratified with "the tendency of the age." He would have found the best men in the denomination earnestly protesting against deism, trying in vain to stem the tide of open infidelity that is sweeping away the denomination. But he would also have found among our "religious" anniversaries in Boston this year, a public meeting "to consider the condition, wants and prospects of free religion in America." This is really a split of the radical from the conservative Unitarians. It was distinctly set forth by the chairman of the meeting, Rev. O. B. Frothingham, that the movement originated with "Unitarians," or those having "their root in Unitarianism." It was distinctively a Unitarian movement, but it was an openly infidel movement. The design was to unite the enemies of Christianity. The name Christianity was spurned by many. The "absolute religion," the religion of the natural man, open paganism, was advocated. The meeting was not opened by prayer. The only prayer made was made near the close by an insane man, who declared even their "freedom" to be a "chain." This Association is to become one of the features of Anniversary Week. This first meeting was, on the whole, rather tedious. Three manuscripts were produced, one of which occupied fifty minutes. Every speaker stood for himself, and most assailed the others. It was "Individualism gone to seed." The meeting was a striking illustration of the intellectual confusion and practical folly arising from the efforts of man to draw spiritual life from a depraved heart

and a head unilluminated by the word of the living God. Such definitions of religion, and such metaphysics, and such definitions of morality do not often appear in well-dressed companies, unless indeed in the congregations of some of these curious "ministers of the Gospel." Yet this little meeting, so contemptible in appearance, is undoubtedly a grand era in the rationalistic church. Said the reverend chairman: "The time for a new religious departure has come." "The great exodus has long been going on." Egypt is left behind, and after passing the wilderness the promised land will appear. The ambition of these men is wonderful. They act on the teaching of Mr. Parker that Christ by no means knew so much as the moderns. Says *The Radical*: "It is perfectly possible that Jesus and his Jewish disciples, being among the earliest, were, in some respects, the poorest fruit of this indwelling divinity." We have come, therefore, to a new reformation, at least as important as that under Luther, and by some held to be as important as the Exodus and the Christian era. This is a great reformation. Was not Channing an Erasmus? Was not Parker a Calvin? Is not the editor of the *Christian Examiner* a Melancthon? Perhaps, however, we are mistaken about Erasmus. A writer in *The Radical* for April, seems to bear away the palm in this new revival of learning. In advocating infidel missions to the West, the writer says: "It is possible to use the Unitarian divinity schools"; but first, it is needful to make the "instruction more free and broad"; "some relics of superstition, such as the pious investigation of Israelitish heathenism in the original Hebrew, need to be pruned away." It is not very generally understood outside rationalistic circles; but we are living in a most remarkable era; and these "highly cultivated" men around us are reformers. In a little while they will be famous. Perhaps we ought not, however, to say that they will be like Luther and Calvin and Knox, for these were all narrow, bigoted men; rather we compliment them by comparing them with the great names they love, Voltaire, Hobbes, Hume and Paine.

It might be suitable at this point to enter somewhat more particularly into an account of the singular system of pagan-



ism which these reformers propose to introduce in the place of Christianity. But we reserve this theme till cooler weather.

It is suitable, however, in this connection to follow out our purpose to say something of the effect of Mr. Lecky's book. The book will unquestionably confirm rationalists in their views. Any man who has become involved in the doctrinal teachings of the "Christian" opponents of Christianity, will, by reading this book, be confirmed in his dogmatism, and will be more fierce for his sect, and more intolerant of the Orthodox heretics than ever. We can not say that we consider this a serious mischief: it is to be regretted; but the regret reaches further back: original sin is to be regretted; total depravity is to be regretted; and it is seriously a sad thing that any should become voluntarily so blinded by passion, or by prejudice, or by training, or by circumstances, as to be unable to see the beauty and glory of the Christian system and the infallible word of the Lord. But since men do in great numbers reject the truth, we may not wonder if they are confirmed in it by all who see things from this peculiar standpoint; and we may not much regret it since decision of character is desirable in the moral world, and all things tend toward the valley of decision. We need to know what is truth and what is error; and God hasten the day of battle. We need to have just such books as this to lead men to take sides and to stand up to fight. Here have been "Christian" teachers of vital error; some of them really Christian men, who have fed on the sincere milk of the word, who have known more about milk than meat, and who have known very little about the bones of the Gospel, but men who, nevertheless, have had a "bone theology," a theology of the feelings and not of the intellect and of the sense; yet teaching vital error, taking out the doctrines of the Bible, denying the full inspiration of the Bible, and opening the way for the savage Theodore Parker and the genial Mr. Lecky. In one of the early numbers of the *Spirit of the Pilgrims* it was shown that the term infidelity, as it has been applied to the English deists, was equally applicable to many men concealing themselves under the name Unitarian, since the infidelity of both consisted merely in denying the full inspiration of the

Bible. The Unitarian denomination has, like the charity it so freely claims, covered a multitude of sins and sinners, in that it has given shelter to a multitude who have covertly or openly attacked the plenary inspiration of the Bible. We will allow no one to surpass us in praising the truly Christian spirit of some who call themselves Unitarians. We confess that we admire the frankness and zeal with which some of them stand up for the truth as they understand it, and who hold that the truth is for use as a missionary power in saving men from the power of sin. But we will allow no one to surpass us in condemning the theological errors taught by the Unitarian church.

If you deny the entire sinfulness of man, if you deny the deity of Christ, if you deny that his death on the cross was needful to furnish a way of salvation for man, if you deny the need of divine power in regenerating man, if you deny the plenary inspiration of the Bible, you may perhaps, in spite of your nominal unbelief, really believe, and be a Christian; but your theology leads logically straight to paganism, a mere natural religion in which the natural man develops his evil heart and calls the "development," whatever it is, a "religion" acceptable to God. Theodore Parker is the logical result of the teachings of Channing. "To put Dr. Channing and Theodore Parker, differ as they did in theology, into opposite categories, is a mistake in every way." So says Dr. Bellows. But they did not so greatly "differ in theology." Mr. Parker merely carried out the principles taught by Dr. Channing. Professor Stuart long ago said that it would come to this. In this, Unitarianism has done infinite mischief. It has prepared the way for open infidelity. Infidel books establish and confirm many, who still flatter themselves that they are Christian, in their opposition to the peculiar teachings of the Bible, and in their opposition to the Bible itself as the infallible word of God. There are many now who were in childhood trained up under influences which have made them bitter in their opposition to all that is Orthodox, and their opposition is so great that it seems morally certain that they will never receive the Orthodox dogma that the Bible is the infallible word of the living God. Now such eagerly snatch at Mr. Lecky's book, and say: We now feel perfectly sure that Orthodoxy is the same in spirit with the Catholic

church, and both are failing, and we are triumphing; we take the morals of Christianity and leave its dogmas and superstitions behind; we tear out the Sermon on the Mount and throw away the rest of the Bible; we are developing into a millennium after our own fashion. So Paine also taught. He had a "respect for the moral character of Christ," and praised "the most excellent morality" of his teachings, though he could not understand the doctrine of turning the cheek to him who would smite you, and despised the "feigned morality" of "loving enemies." But we hail the day of decision when Paine shall have his own followers; a day for the crumbling of a baptised infidelity. Let the angel of light show hoof and horn.

Let us hope that another effect of this book will be to quicken men in the study of history. We commend the study of history to the rank and file of our rationalistic friends. The study, if it is profound enough, may enlarge their minds. A shallow knowledge of history may mislead you. History is so full of matter that it may be made to support the wildest theories. Suppose you want to make a book: There are so many facts on record that all you need to do is to go through the centuries, taking the facts that can be made to sustain any particular theory you may happen to have, and, meantime, carefully avoid citing or even seeing the facts that militate against the position; and you will be then prepared to make a sensation. Ignorant men will read your book and say: Surely this man has the ages to support his statements. It is in this way that the *History of Rationalism* is written. A vast array of facts show that Mr. Lecky is in the right; and a still greater number might be arrayed to show that he is all wrong. The evidence against him is as overwhelming as an avalanche. He can not stand a moment before a fair, truthful presentation of the history of Europe. See how easy it is to write an untruthful history; see how easy it is to cite facts. Here are facts: Abraham lied; Jacob was dishonest; Moses was angry; Aaron made a golden calf; Gideon was covetous; David was a murderer; Peter denied Christ, and John called for fire from heaven to consume his enemies. Do not cite any more facts in regard to these men or the time in which they lived: now draw your inference, and say that the church of God has

been made up of rascals. All this it is easy enough to do; and it may be that very ignorant men will be deceived by your statements. But then if you want to know the whole truth, you need to know all the facts in regard to these men; and after you have found out these facts, you are not yet able to make up your mind about the character of these men; you must compare them with the other men in the generation in which they lived. This is the only fair way of judging their characters. Compare Abraham with the Sodomites; Jacob with Laban and Esau; Moses with Pharaoh; Aaron with Balaam; David with the Philistine champions; Peter and John with Pilate and Nero. Do this and then you will infer, not that the church of God has been made up of rascals, but that the Scripture phrase is true which represents the church in the world as a lily among thorns. Mr. Lecky would have made a very much more truthful book if he had been blessed with a more comprehensive mind, and if he had learned to generalize. An inability to generalize leaves the mind a prey to almost any error that may try to seize it. The whole Universalist denomination, so far as it pretends to rest on the Bible, is based on a few isolated texts; the denomination takes no comprehensive view of the Bible. Spiritualism is based on one class of facts; other facts are ignored. Unitarians, so far as they pretend to take the Bible, do not deal much with the mass of texts relating to the atonement, only as illustrations when they exhort men to self-sacrifice. So the rationalists take such facts as suit them and leave out others. They claim to take the universal religion, but they leave out the most vital doctrines. The universal religion believes in the endless punishment of the wicked, and in the need of sacrifices; but these are left out by the rationalists. They do not comprehend the universal religion. Rationalists are narrow men.

It does not take much to make a rationalist. Take a substratum of native depravity, and set a man to acquiring the universal religion, that is, let him read what he pleases, believe what he pleases and do what he pleases; and let every man blow his own trumpet, and if possible blow a little for neighboring rationalists. Talk a great deal about culture and taste, and show your taste by frequent inuendos against your mother's

religion; hate the Orthodox with the hatred of a bigot; be sure you call yourself liberal; and make it appear that there would be found many men of like spirit if you could be induced to be so vulgar as to count. It is easy to make a rationalist. It is easy to make an *ism*. It is easy to make rationalism. It takes few men. There are vast multitudes of irreligious men in the world, men who hate the truth, and who are disobedient to it; they would about as soon be called one thing as another, provided they are not called Puritans or Orthodox; some of them would just as soon as not be gathered into pretty meeting-houses to hear men of "culture" talk of taste or political economy. If a few men agree to call this company rationalists, or liberal Christians, or Unitarians, what is the harm? And if considerable many people do not object to the name, but on the whole feel rather proud that now they have a "religion," where is the harm? Does it not stand in proof then that rationalism has wonderfully increased? It is a little amusing to consider the narrow grounds of the assumptions made by rationalists. It is assumed that the tendency of the age is fast undermining Christianity. But there was never a time when the Christian faith stood firmer in the world than it stands to-day. There are always irreligious men enough in the country, and it makes little difference whether you baptize them and call them Christians, or whether you call them rationalists, or, the enlightened public, or what not. It is nothing more nor less than the same old human sinfulness that Christianity has been battling so long. It is easy to boast; a few men can boast. It takes only a few men to make a great fuss. Our neighbor from the forest says that half a dozen wolves in the night will make so much noise that you think the forest is full of them. Read the writings of our "Brahmin class," and you will find that they make great use of each other; but the reputation of some of these fine writers will not be worth much in three hundred years. A very small and select mutual admiration society can praise each other in print. It can be printed, on tinted paper if need be, that A. B. is the most profound philosopher of the age, and that B. C. is a great poet, and that C. D. has a fine style, and that D. E. is a genius to be remembered forever, and that the works of these

great writers will be immortal, and that rationalistic "culture" thrives. A very few men can say that Orthodoxy is tumbling down. Almost any man can read history little or much and gather up a number of isolated facts to make it appear that infidelity is about to triumph, and there are ignorant men enough among the Brahmins to read and believe and praise. It is easy for a few men to manage to get colleges and churches into their hands, and to use literary magazines for infidel purposes. But Orthodoxy did not mind losing Harvard College, or a few churches; and nobody cares much if the *North American Review* and the *Atlantic Monthly* go over to open Unitarianism or open infidelity. "If they will only say so," adds our neighbor. But they have said so; and let them go. The loss will not be very profoundly felt by anybody. Other churches and other colleges have arisen; and it is possible that at some future time there may be intellect enough in New England to carry on other reviews and magazines. It may be that "culture" and "style" and "mutual admiration" will be lacking; we could not think of having these things; but we are a plain, puritanical sort of people, and we can get on without such stuff. Meantime we would suggest to the publishers of the *Atlantic* that a salaried gossip, kept in pay to slander Orthodox ministers, is a very valuable contributor to a purely literary magazine. Slander is good as a mere matter of taste. It is also cheap. Almost any foolish old woman can be hired to write such stories, and to do it well enough to secure the applause of the highly cultivated Brahmins who are supposed to read the *Atlantic Monthly*.

But seriously we would recommend these cultivated men to the profound study of facts. Let us hope that one effect of Mr. Lecky's book will be to excite men to take hold of historical studies. Orthodox and rationalist may be greatly edified by this sort of work. What does history teach? What is the tendency of the age? It is childish to boast. Give us the facts. Let the thing be tested. Is Christianity decaying? Are the Christian doctrines giving way? Is rationalism about to sweep the earth? In the first half of this century one of the New England States showed an increase of evangelical church members in proportion to the whole population three-

fold. Such facts abound. All history is full of matter to show the development of the power of Christianity, and to show that Christianity alone affords hope to a race cursed by sin. If, then, a man rises and says that the old institutions of the devil were the children of the church, and if he undertakes to prove his assertion from history, let him be met by history. But most men are so ignorant of history that they are related to a historian as Dr. Kane's readers were related to him; a man who had never been to the North Pole could hardly dispute anything the Doctor might say. There are few men well read in history; and if infidelity professes to make profound discoveries in that field, we shall be glad if Christian men also feel compelled to explore that unknown region. The science of history is in its infancy. While the leading facts are known, many of the facts and the theories are obscure and confused. But well-established history affords the most striking proofs of the truth of the Christian system. The time is coming when far greater attention will be paid to this branch of study. Clergy and laity are yet to take to this work. Masters will abound when pupils multiply. A thorough study of history is a great and crying want of the present generation. Can we not have a new zeal imparted to this study? The field is so vast that it needs to be occupied by an army of Christian men. One man can do but little. Who can gain an accurate knowledge of the eighteen Christian centuries? Who can theorize without a knowledge of the facts? There must be a profound study of the sources of history. Men must plunge into the obscure recesses of the early and the middle ages. The true history of the Reformation is by no means commonly understood. This is specially true of the Genevan reform. Few are very well acquainted with Scotch and Puritan movements. The greater part of our people are not familiar with the history of the church even since the Reformation. The history of the formation of doctrine is not popularized. The relation between doctrine and morality needs to receive searching study. There is to be a battle just here. This is a fine subject for years of study: to show from history the connection between doctrine and morality. The adaptedness of the Bible doctrines to man can be shown. The Christian apologists of the coming



generation will draw more material from history than from any other source. Says the *Christian Examiner*: "History is being rewritten in our generation under the inspiration of Liberal Christianity." The enemies of the truth study history and announce that Christianity has had its day, and that in important respects it has done incalculable mischief as well as a certain good. The Christian doctrines are assailed from the historical standpoint. It is asserted that Christian dogmas have perhaps for a time done good service in the early days of Christianity, but their mission is now done, and they only hinder the progress of the race. Facts are gathered from history which seem to enforce these statements. Unless these statements are met by Christian men who know whereof they affirm, unless Christian men know history, unless Christian men popularize the true history of the church, incalculable evil will be done. Let Christian men pursue such courses of study as shall make them strong to defend the faith.

In some points we would commend Mr. Lecky as a model for Orthodox clergymen. Sometimes, indeed, his style is foggy, but usually the style is good, and sometimes marvelously good when compared with the style of some sermons. A clear, ringing style in the pulpit is better than a bell in the church tower to get people out to meeting. Mr. Lecky is remarkable for his apparent moderation. His style is restrained. He does not appear to exaggerate. Too much can not be said in praise of his urbanity. His sentiments are often atrocious, but he is a gentleman. His culture is evidently far superior to that of any American rationalistic writer. But, besides his style, he has ideas. He has managed to mass a great deal of matter in his plan, much of it irrelevant, but much of it supporting his subject. He has made an elaborate book. It is the result of long study. Half of the book is light reading; the other half you want to think about. If you read the book questioning every paragraph or sentence, asking, Is this true, or false? you will find that you have more ideas when you are through the book than when you began. The book is eminently suggestive; and in this respect is commended to all sermon makers. But another point is this: Mr. Lecky has evidently run in no

rut in his study. He has made wheel-tracks in many directions. He has read infidel writers, enough of them, and some of the Orthodox. The variety of information brought to light in the text and in the notes hints of long hours in the study. We hope that Mr. Lecky will find readers among our clergy, and that we shall have many among us who love to see ourselves as others see us, and who love to find out what the enemies of the truth say, and who love to go over the Christian evidences again and again in the face of the enemy. The man who loves to pray over his studies, and who loves to mingle intense pastoral work with his studies, will be in no danger of falling from the faith by reading infidel books; but on the other hand, the perusal may establish him in the faith, and make him stronger for meeting the people of his own parish. We must know books in order to know men. We must know men or we can not save them. We must know the truth and know it, or our knowledge of men will be useless. The great use of having infidels in the world is to teach Orthodox ministers to think. Christianity must go to school to her enemies. We get the main part of our thinking by going to God; but if we turn aside now and then and examine the devil and his lies, we shall then more than ever before know that we hold the very truth of God.

---

## ARTICLE VIII.

### SHORT SERMONS.

"And when he was in affliction, he besought the Lord his God, and humbled himself greatly before the God of his fathers, and prayed unto him: and he was entreated of him, and heard his supplication, and brought him again to Jerusalem into his kingdom. Then Manasseh knew that the Lord he was God."—2 *Chron.* xxxiii. 12, 13.

KINGS are but men. Birth, position, distinction, do not relieve a man from personal responsibility to God. Histories of such are recorded for general admonition or encouragement or both. In the

history of Manasseh the chief interest should be to discover his moral character and the influences which contributed to make it what it was. It may be divided into two periods.

Under the first period of Manasseh's history may be noticed,

1. His great natural advantage by virtue of a godly parentage.
2. His misfortune in being orphaned at twelve years of age.
3. His misfortune in being surrounded by evil counsellors; and
4. His inexcusableness in yielding to them.
5. His aggravated degeneracy. (a) Disregarded his father's good instruction and example. (b) Dishonored his father's good reign by undoing his work. (c) Dishonored himself by reigning as badly as possible.
6. The savage form of his idolatry. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 6.
7. His amazing credulity. Spiritism. xxxiii.
8. His profanation of the temple of God by enthroning an image.
9. His seduction of his people.
10. His scorn of God's terrible threat. 2 Kings, xxi. 10-16. He grew worse and worse. The bane of his own realm.

11. His downfall. The nation heathen, vicious, idle, weak, a tempting and easy prey to the invader. His captivity and exile.

Under the second period of his history may be noticed

1. The good effect of his adversity; as leading him (a) To renounce his idolatry, (b) To acknowledge God, (c) To repent of his sins, (d) To pray for pardon, and for restoration to his throne.
2. The mercy he found: (a) God had compassion, (b) And heard his prayer, (c) And restored him to his kingdom.
3. The results of his reformation. (a) He fortified the holy city. (b) He destroyed the images; in spite of shame, and cavils, and prejudices. (c) He restored the true religion. Repaired the sanctuary, reorganized the Jewish worship, put away his spiritism as an abomination, and sought the reformation of his people, which latter was a slow and difficult work.

What a contrast between the first and the second period of his history! in his character, acts, and influence. Eminent in wickedness, and afterwards in piety and good works. Ruined many, and perhaps was instrumental in saving many. Learn:

1. That grace is not inherited.
2. The danger of once departing from the course of rectitude.
3. That evil counsellors should be avoided.
4. That the sons of the most godly men may become the foulest slanderers and most bitter enemies of evangelical religion and evangelical men.

5. That spiritism is contrary to the word of God, and loathsome to a truly converted man.

6. That individuals and the state may be corrupted much easier than reformed.

7. That the most abandoned may be saved by grace. Manasseh, the prodigal son, the thief on the cross, Saul of Tarsus.

8. The godly life of those who have been renewed out of great wickedness is a striking proof of the reality and power of Christianity.

---

“And they said one to another: Did not our heart burn within us while he talked with us by the way, and while he opened to us the Scriptures?”—*Luke xxiv. 32.*

THE resurrection of Christ was as essential as his death, in order that sinners might be saved. 1 Cor. xv. 17-19. His death is universally admitted, though the sacrificial nature of it is often denied. But because the denial of the expiatory value of his death is accompanied by the denial of his eternal Sonship with the Father, his resurrection is by many denied even as a historical fact. The report of it by his disciples was immediately denied by his enemies. Though their denial of his resurrection is inconsistent, and completely refuted by the Scriptures, it is still accepted as true testimony by many who regard him as a model man; as if his own claim to his resurrection, if false, were not a fatal detraction from the transcendent human excellence which they ascribe to him! Perhaps some, who dare not deny the inspired record, are still perplexed with doubts and questionings concerning a fact so miraculous, so entirely beyond the power of mere human philosophy to account for.

There is, however, another kind of testimony to the resurrection of Christ, which the more candid unbeliever may respect though not fully appreciate, which the infidel does not care to recognize and is utterly incompetent to deny. This testimony was referred to by those two disciples who asked each other the question recorded in the text. It is

*The testimony of Christian consciousness to the resurrection of Christ.*

The first element of this testimony is the believer's conscious peace. (a) Peace with God. God no longer condemns. Rom. v. 1; viii. 1. (b) Peace with conscience. Conscience no longer condemns. 1 John iii. 21. (c) The constant and growing serenity of

soul, which results from peace with God and peace with conscience. Isaiah xxvi. 3; Rom. xv. 13; Phil. iv. 7. This threefold peace is the result, not of a mere compact, but of acceptance with God through the merits of Christ on the one part, and of acquiescence in the atonement which satisfies divine justice and the sense of justice in the heart on the other. And this is not peculiar to the individual believer, but common to all believers.

If the resurrection of Christ were not a vital part of the divine plan of salvation, such peace were impossible. Without expiation as a basis no mercy could be shown to a sinner; and the acceptance of Christ's death, by the Father, as an expiation for sin, involves his resurrection as the condition to his ascension and priesthood. Heb. vii. 24, 25; viii. 4, 5, 6; ix. 11-15. But the believer's peace is peace in believing, and faith in Christ as an atoning Saviour is impossible except on the ground of his resurrection. 1 Cor. xv. 17, 19. Rom. iv. 24, 25. The believer's peace is thus a testimony to the resurrection of Christ, which no false testimony can destroy. The burning heart of the disciples, whose perplexity at the report of Christ's resurrection he, as a stranger, relieved by opening to them the Scriptures, shows that they now believed in him as risen.

The second element of this testimony is the believer's conscious delight in communing with Christ. (a) Communion is between the living. Matt. xxii. 31, 32. Christ is the Son of God in human nature, and therefore must still be living in that nature in order to be in communion with the believer. (b) The believer communes with Christ by thinking of him, speaking of him, addressing him. The burning heart attests such communion. (c) The believer communes with Christ by communing in spiritual things even with the stranger who bears Christ's image. The "stranger" himself, with whom the two disciples on the way to Emmaus communed, was the risen Jesus. Their burning heart proved the fact to themselves. This is incontrovertible testimony.

A third element of this testimony is the believer's delight in laboring for Christ. (a) He serves a living Master. Heb. xiii. 8. (b) He does good to his Master's disciples. As soon as their eyes were opened to know him, the disciples of Emmaus forgot their weariness, and felt no desire to sleep, and hastened back to Jerusalem to bear witness of the resurrection of Christ to the disciples there. They arrived late, but "found the eleven gathered together," and others with them, equally eager to bear witness that Christ had risen. (c) He seeks to bring the impenitent to Christ. Christ was sure of Paul "as of one born out of due time," and Paul could not but preach him as the Saviour of the lost. 1 Cor. ix. 16. (d) His

delight to labor for Christ converts secular into holy time. The disciples of Emmaus began their labor as his witnesses on the first day of the week, thus consecrating by their labor what he had consecrated by his resurrection, the first day as the Christian Sabbath.

In the Christian consciousness, then, there is a testimony to the resurrection of Christ, before which doubt, denial, and destructive criticism must yield.

Let Christians learn to trust the testimony of their own consciousness. It is the counterpart of the word of God. Christ delights to commune with believers who commune together concerning him. The absence of the burning heart may be very easily accounted for.

Communion with the risen Jesus is the secret of Christian efficiency.

Unbelievers should learn to be very modest in opposing any experimental truth of the word of God.

The way to learn whether any good thing can come out of Nazareth is to come and see. As man believeth with the heart unto righteousness, trial of the truth as it is in Jesus is the true way to test it.

---

## ARTICLE IX.

### LITERARY NOTICES.

- 1.—*The Progress of Doctrine in the New Testament, considered in Eight Lectures delivered before the University of Oxford, on the Bampton Foundation.* By THOMAS DEHANY BERNARD, M. A., of Exeter College, and Rector of Walaot. From the second London edition, with improvements. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1867.

THIS is an attempt, not to prove the reality of a progressive development of doctrine in the New Testament, a fact now generally recognized and admitted, but to ascertain its true character. The position defended in these lectures is that this gradual unfolding of particular doctrines, instead of exhibiting the incongruities and inconsistencies of a merely human conception of the Gospel, does, in fact, illustrate the wisdom of that presiding Mind which gave the revelation this form, as best fitted for permanent and universal use,

that there can be traced, throughout, the unity of a divine plan and the continuity of a divine purpose, and that this divine teaching reaches its perfect stage of development as a revelation in the Scriptures of the New Testament, and coincides in extent with those Scriptures.

The subject is a very important one and is extremely well handled. The attention of the reader is held, and his assent secured, while the successive stages of development are traced through parable and history, epistle and prophecy, from the manger in Bethlehem to the city of God, until the revelation stands before him rounded and complete. It is not a new vein of thought which the author has opened, but we must give him credit for having worked it more thoroughly and with richer results than any who have preceded him. His style is remarkably pure, transparent and animated; his thinking is fresh, logical and vigorously sustained. His treatment of his subject is candid, thorough and scholarly, while his spirit is profoundly earnest and reverent. It is rare that we meet with a book of the kind so readable. We welcome it as a contribution of real strength to the defences of Christianity. Though not controversial in form, it grapples manfully and successfully with some of the subtlest objections of the recent sceptical criticism. Its method of doing this illustrates the tendencies of the time to rely more on the internal, than the external, evidences of Christianity, while its success confirms our faith in the impregnable strength of those evidences. But it is not alone in this aspect of it that the book is a valuable one. We turn from the perusal of it to read the New Testament with increased interest and satisfaction.

To many readers these lectures will suggest much more than they directly reveal. If the author would enlarge the plan of his work so as to include the Old Testament, and trace the progress of doctrine from the beginning of the creation onward to the consummated glory of the kingdom of God, he would lay the Christian public under new obligations.

2.—*Notes, Critical and Explanatory, on the Book of Genesis.* 2 Vols. By MELANCTHON W. JACOBUS, Professor of Biblical Literature in the Theological Seminary at Allegheny, Pa. New York: R. Carter & Brothers.

THIS is a clear, practical common sense commentary, serviceable for the masses of readers. It is learned and profound where necessary, still it is simple, and the reader is not burdened by its erudition, or confused by labored explanations.



The first volume, which extends from the creation to the Abrahamic covenant, is preceded by an Introduction of forty six pages, covering the authorship and credibility of the Pentateuch. In this the learned author passes in close review the various sceptical theories and supposed scientific difficulties that modern infidelity has thrown around these five opening books of the Bible. An epitome of objections and defences as to the six days of creation is well given, the internal evidences of the book to its own genuineness are collected, as well as the testimony of the New Testament for the Old. Geology, philology, ethnology and universal history, are summoned as witnesses. A very useful code of laws for historical interpretation is introduced and used with effect. The exegesis, explanation and practical remarks are brief, plain and to the point, and the difficult passages are rather met than shunned; so that we can heartily commend the work as one of the very best hand-books for ordinary students of this part of the Scriptures.

The second volume, from the covenant with Abraham to the end, is worthy of careful study, and is a publication eminently pertinent, in these times when notions are so vague and erroneous on the origin, nature, unity and perpetuity of the church of God in this world.

3.—*Memoirs and Correspondence of Madame Recamier*. Translated from the French, and edited by ISAPHENE M. LUYSTER. 12mo. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1867.

A LADY, whose fascinating qualities have put in requisition the critical and commemorative labors of Guizot and Sainte Beuve, who numbered among her crowd of devoted friends Chateaubriand, Bernadotte, De Toqueville, Madame De Staël, and who had self-respect and decision enough to repel the political and amatory advances of even the first Napoleon, at the zenith of the empire, certainly deserves the careful editorial study bestowed upon her in this inviting volume. Mme. Récamier was one of those queens of society, charming in private and influential in public life, of which France seems almost to have had the monopoly. In her day, she was the most beautiful woman in Europe, the belle of the Parisian salons. But no one seemed to regard with jealousy her unrivalled ascendancy in the fashionable world, such was her artless or her exquisite tact in disarming hostility. Her coquetry, if not too amiable to inflict severe wounds, had a singular power to soothe their pain. Those who did not escape it seldom could refuse her their lifelong friendship.

This volume, a condensation of the bulkier work of Mme. Le-

normant, is full of the sprightly, gossiping interest of the familiar life of its subject and her friends, as given us in their letters to her; of hers, there is an unprecedented scarcity. Her letters are supposed to have perished by some unexplained mishap. The salient points of a state of society, as unlike our own as is easily conceivable, are thus presented to us; anecdotes, sketches of people and things, habits, opinions, pleasantries of great variety and brilliance, which sometimes remind us of a condition of morals that by no means commands our approval. But for a study of life and character, which we have no wish, indeed, to see reproduced among ourselves, the book is well worth perusal. The plentiful sprinkling over its pages of names which made illustrious the court and camp of Bonaparte, is enough to entice the reader who is curious to know the unstudied, unobserved side of great people's histories. That great man's petty malice towards the noble woman who would not fall down and adore him, shows how short also may be the distance from the *magnifique* to the contemptible.

- 4.—*Benedicite*: Illustrations of the Power, Wisdom, and Goodness of God, as manifested in his Works. By G. CHAPIN CHILD, M. D. Two volumes in one. 12mo. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son. 1867.

NATURAL theology, pursued under Christian light and motive, is a noble science. Substantially the Psalmist so contemplated it when the heavens were telling him the glory of the Lord. Undevoutly and atheistically studied, nature only makes pagans of our philosophers. The work before us is not open to this grave condemnation. Taking up the various topics of the hymn, *Benedicite, omnia opera*, the author discusses, in a fine vein of religious sentiment, what is revealed to us of God in the manifold forces and operations of the material world—sun, moon, stars, seasons, light, darkness, waters, clouds, winds, heat, cold, mountains, oceans, beasts, birds, swimming creatures—their laws of action and of life, in recondite as well as more obvious manifestations. His scope of illustration is wide, and his knowledge various and sound. His thought is fresh, and his argument clear and well sustained: His work, though full of curious inquiry, tends to something much better than the gratifying of a mere curiosity. It ministers strongly to the culture of pious feeling and character. We take leave at this point, to express our protest against some criticism which we have lately seen, in some of our American imitators of the smart and captious *Saturday Review*, depreciating, if not ridiculing the class of literature which the "Bridgewater Treatises" made conspicuous, several years ago, and

to which the book in hand is a worthy contribution. It is not wonderful that those, who have no patience with revealed religion, should wish to expel from our confidence the natural revelation of "The Great Architect," and to leave us literally a world without God. But when men talk of the puerility of such studies as have tasked the strength of writers like Paley and Chalmers and Brougham and their noble co-laborers in Natural Theology, they must expect to be told, without apology, that their criticism is worse than peurile; it is the utterly contemptible cant of the thinnest, slenderest, however pretentious, pseudo-philosophy. Meanwhile we welcome this elegant volume, and without endorsing all its teachings, we commend it to the "wise who understand," and to the as yet not wise, who have not made up their minds to know nothing which they ought to know concerning God.

Here and there a slip occurs; as, "the elephant has got a skin"—where *got* is superfluous and ungraceful. Also "the mission of the Kangaroo" (293), and "the summer mission of the wasps" (295), is a little wider extension of the missionary field than we think to be in the best taste. If this be an Americanism, our English author has certainly quite outrun our usage. But generally his volume is marked by great carefulness.

5.—*History of England from the Fall of Wolsey to the Death of Elizabeth.* By JAMES ANTHONY FROUDE, M. A., late Fellow of Exeter College, Oxford.

*Reign of Elizabeth.* Vols. III., IV. New York: Charles Scribner & Company. 1867.

THESE two volumes extend over a period of seven years, from the beginning of the year 1567 to the close of 1573. The tragedy of Kirk-a-Field occurred on the night of February 9th, 1567, and on the morning of the 15th of May following Mary Stuart became the wife of Bothwell, whom Mr. Froude characterizes as "the foulest ruffian among her subjects"; his own wife having been divorced with all possible haste after the murder of Darnley, to prepare the way, on his side, for the shameful union. It was one of the strangest, most humiliating infatuations which history records, the passion of that most brilliant and most beautiful of women, a Queen in her own right, the daughter of a king, and presumptive heiress to the crown of England, for that "thick-limbed scoundrel" Henry Bothwell, a man whose whole life had been notoriously an unbroken career of foulness and shame! The interest which the life of Mary Stuart has awakened is largely owing to the fact that

she stood related closely to grand historic events in which all the civilized world was concerned. The murders of Rizzio and Darnley were, in themselves, incidents to excite little notice, such was the character of the age, so abounding in every species of evil deed. This is so well put by Mr. Froude, in a passage of great force and beauty at the opening of the first of these two volumes, that we are tempted to quote it :

"Enormous crimes are not subjects on which it is desirable to stimulate curiosity, and had the assassination of Darnley been no more than a vulgar act of wickedness; had the mysteries connected with it and the results arising from it extended only to the persons, the motives, and the escape or punishment of the perpetrators or their accessories, it might have remained a problem for curious speculation, but it could neither have deserved nor demanded the tedious attention of the historian. Those events only are of permanent importance which have either affected the fortunes of nations or have illustrated in some signal manner the character of the epochs at which they have occurred. If the tragedy at Kirk-a-Field had possessed no claim for notice on the first of these grounds, deeds of violence were too common in the great families of Scotland in the sixteenth century to have justified a minute consideration of a single special act of villany.

But the death of the husband of the Queen of Scots belongs to that rare class of incidents which, like the murder of Cæsar, have touched the interests of the entire educated world." Vol. III., p. 1.

This passage, as strictly true as it is eloquent and philosophical, presents but a sorry picture of the state of morals among the nobility in the age of John Knox and the Puritans. Yet the Ormiston, the Powrys, the Hepburns and the Lady Buccleughs of that stormy period, surpassed the great of other times and countries, not so much in the extent of their wickedness as in the unrestrained violence, or the unblushing coarseness of its manifestation, while the good were perhaps no better than the men whom God has raised up in every age to bear witness for his name.

Mr. Froude paints with a terrible distinctness. He sets his reader down at Holyrood on the morning after the murder of Darnley, and makes the successive acts of the dark tragedy with its thrilling incidents, great and small, pass before him as in a moving diorama. There is no possibility of mistake as to the part of Mary Stuart and Bothwell in the crime, or the infamous end which they sought.

Elizabeth had a most difficult part to act, and she performed her part on the whole with consummate ability. Largely as her wisdom consisted in a caution which was sometimes carried so far as to have the appearance of cowardice, she never lacked the courage to

pursue with utmost decision and firmness the course which mature deliberation and sound advice dictated. Her sympathy for Mary was the result mainly, no doubt, of her own prerogative as a crowned head in the true succession, and her extreme jealousy of any popular manifestation that might seem to trench on the *jus divinum*. Yet she would not express that sympathy in such a way as to call in question her deep abhorrence of the crime which had been perpetrated, or involve her in the most distant complicity with Mary's guilt.

Mr. Froude's opinion of Mary is expressed in his own brief and pungent way, as follows :

"Nestled in the heart of England lay the bosom serpent, as Walsingham called the Queen of Scots, with the longing eyes of the English nobles fastened upon her as their coming deliverer. There she lay, deserving, if crime could deserve, the highest gallows on which ever murderer swung, yet guarded by the mystic sanctity of her birth-claim to the Crown." Vol. iv., p. 118.

It is pleasant to remember that the sixteenth century was not less remarkable for good than for evil in human character and conduct. Jeremiah's two baskets of figs represented a fact which was to be perpetual in the history of man under Christ's providential government of the church and the world. Of the Puritans in the days of Elizabeth our author says :

"But there was another form, quieter, purer, nobler far, in England, in which the new ideas were developing themselves, and that was Puritanism." Vol. iv., p. 108.

And again :

"If the young Puritans, in the heat and glow of their convictions, snapped their traces and flung off their harness, it was they, after all, who saved the church which attempted to disown them, and with the church saved also the stolid mediocrity to which the fates then and ever committed and commit the government of it." iv., 114, 15.

Among the illustrious men who helped to shape the events of that period and to save whatever was of chiefest value from threatened destruction, there was no one to whose greatness and goodness posterity will more cheerfully and unanimously yield its homage than to John Knox. He was a man of giant intellect, profound sagacity, and the loftiest Christian heroism, a man whom no bribes or flatteries could seduce, and no dangers could appal. How dearly he loved his country, and how much more dearly the kingdom of Jesus Christ ! The character and designs of Mary Stuart he read as easily as a book, and could not be swerved a single hair-breadth from

his clear and fixed judgment by all the world. There was a grandeur and force in his eloquence which "stirred his countrymen, 'like ten thousand trumpets,'" and its influence was felt for God and his country to the last.

Very touching and very beautiful is the account of the passing away of the great man, "the one supremely great man that Scotland possessed—the one man without whom Scotland, as the modern world has known it, would have had no existence"—from the earth on which he had acted so illustrious a part:

"On the 17th of November [1572] the elders of the congregation came to his bed to receive his last instructions. He went over the chief incidents of the last year with them. 'He had done his best to instruct them,' he said, 'and if at any time he had spoken hardly, it was not from passion or ill will, but only to overcome their faults. Now that he was going away, he could but charge them to remain true—to make no compromise with evil—especially to yield in nothing to the Castle—rather to fly with David to the mountains than remain at home in the company of the wicked.'

"Two days later, the 19th, Morton came, and Ruthven and Glencairn; and to them he spoke at length, though what passed none ever knew. Afterwards some fine lady came 'to praise him,' to flatter him in a foolish way for the great things which he had done. 'Hush, hush!' he said; 'flesh is ower proud, and needs no means to esteem the self.'

"He was rapidly going. On the 23d he told the people that were about him that he had been meditating through the night on the troubles of the Kirk. He had been earnest in prayer with God for it. He had wrestled with Satan, and had prevailed. He repeated the Apostle's Creed and the Lord's Prayer, pausing after the first petition to say, 'Who can pronounce so holy words!' It was the day on which a fast had been appointed by the Convention for special meditation upon the massacre. After sermon many eager persons came to his bedside, and, though his breath was coming thick and slow, he continued to speak in broken sentences.

"The next morning the end was evidently close. He was restless, rose, half-dressed himself, and then, finding himself too weak to stand, sank back upon his bed. He was asked if he was in pain. He said 'it was no painful pain, but such as would end the battle.' Mrs. Knox read to him St. Paul's words on death. 'Unto thy hand, O Lord,' he cried, 'for the last time, I commend my soul, spirit, and body.' At his own request she then read to him the seventeenth chapter of St. John's Gospel, where he told them he first cast anchor.

"As night fell he seemed to sleep. The family assembled in his room for their ordinary evening prayers, and 'were the longer because they thought he was resting.' He moved as they ended. 'Sir, heard ye the prayers?' said one. 'I would to God,' he answered, 'that ye and all men heard them as I have heard them, and I praise God of the heavenly sound.' Then, with a long sigh, he said: 'Now it is come.' The shadow was creeping over him, and death was at hand. Bannatyne, his secretary, sprang to his side.

“‘Now, sir,’ he said, ‘the time ye have long asked for—to wit, an end of your battle—is come; and, seeing all natural power fails, remember the promise which oftentimes ye have shown me of our Saviour Jesus Christ, and that we may understand ye hear us, make some sign.’

“The dying man gently raised his head, and ‘incontinent thereof, rendered up his spirit.’” Vol. iv., pp. 455, 6.

It was a fitting end for such a man, and a beautiful illustration of the text, “Precious in the sight of the Lord is the death of his saints.” It was the clear and glorious setting of the sun, after a day of alternate brightness and storms, during all which he had kept his steady course in the heavens. So have died the faithful servants of the Lord Jesus Christ in every age, and only they. The death of Mary Stuart differed not so widely from that of Elizabeth as both from the death of John Knox.

Of the character of the great reformer Mr. Froude says :

“The full measure of Knox’s greatness neither he [Morton] nor any man could then estimate. It is as we look back over that stormy time, and weigh the actors in it one against the other, that he stands out in his full proportions. No grander figure can be found, in the entire history of the Reformation in this island, than that of Knox. Cromwell and Burghley rank beside him for the work which they effected, but, as politicians and statesmen, they had to labor with instruments which they soiled their hands in touching. In purity, in uprightness, in courage, truth, and stainless honor, the Regent Murray and our English Latimer were perhaps his equals; but Murray was intellectually far below him, and the sphere of Latimer’s influence was on a smaller scale. The time has come when English history may do justice to one but for whom the reformation would have been overthrown among ourselves; for the spirit which Knox created saved Scotland; and if Scotland had been Catholic again, neither the wisdom of Elizabeth’s ministers, nor the teaching of her bishops, nor her own chicaneries, would have preserved England from revolution. His was the voice which taught the peasant of the Lothians that he was a free man, the equal in the sight of God with the proudest peer or prelate that had trampled on his forefathers. He was the one antagonist whom Mary Stuart could not soften nor Maitland deceive; he it was that raised the poor Commons of his country into a stern and rugged people, who might be hard, narrow, superstitious, and fanatical, but who, nevertheless, were men whom neither king, noble, nor priest could force again to submit to tyranny. And his reward has been the ingratitude of those who most should have done honor to his memory.” Vol. iv., pp. 457–8.

Mr. Froude is a believer in the necessity and the immeasurable value of the Reformation in which Knox bore a hand, and sees in him the mighty power but for which “Mary Stuart would have bent Scotland to her purpose,” and in Knox and Burghley, the two



men who together saved Elizabeth from being "flung from off her throne," or going "back into the Egypt to which she was too often casting wistful eyes." Mr. Froude thinks also that the Papists of to-day are greatly changed as compared with the Papists with whom Knox contended and subdued them, because their power to kill has been taken from them! Doubtless with the restoration of that power, these "forbearing innocents" of the nineteenth century would speedily manifest all the peculiar attributes which characterized the Papists of Philip II., and Mary Tudor.

We are of those who believe that eternal vigilance is the price of the liberty which was achieved in the sixteenth century, and that it behoves to note with exceeding jealousy every movement of the Papacy in our country. We confess ourselves afraid of the female seminaries under Roman Catholic direction so multiplied among us of late, and utterly amazed to see so many Protestant fathers and mothers, and even members of evangelical churches, sending their daughters to these seminaries! Such fathers and mothers should read history.

In our perusal of Mr. Froude's successive volumes we have had a constantly increasing conviction of their exceeding value. He invests with wonderful fascination the grand events which he delineates, so that the reader must be dull indeed who is not both interested and instructed. We are boasting all the while of our unequalled public school system, and the remarkable intelligence resulting. It may be so, but we want to see some new tests applied. According to our standard no young man can claim to be intelligent who is not familiar with the principal characters and events of the "history of England from the fall of Wolsey to the death of Elizabeth." Certainly no American young man can comprehend the history of his own country otherwise. How many of our "intelligent" young men are purchasing these successive volumes of Mr. Scribner's superb edition as they appear, and placing them on their book shelves when they have read, marked, and inwardly digested them? All the light literature and *Ledger* stories that have been published since the beginning of the century are not worth a thousandth part as much for the education of a young man as this one work of English history. Our earnest hope is, that it may be the means of greatly increasing an interest in historical studies among our scholars, as well as our young men generally.

- 6.—*Old England; Its Scenery, Art, and People.* By JAMES M. HOPPIN, Professor in Yale College. 12mo. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

Books upon foreign countries, made up like this from the recollections of travel, have some advantages over the jottings of a tourist upon the wing. If the latter has the greater freshness and dash of first impressions, the other has the chance of a riper reflection, a better toning, and a more finished treatment of the various topics introduced. A large amount of rawness and some measure of positive inaccuracy may be forgiven to the manifest disadvantages of the flying notes which form the staple of our current touring. Even what is copied out of the guide-book may be quite unreliable in point of fact. We take up then a volume like Professor Hoppin's with a comfortable feeling that we are not about to make a lunch of green apples or halfgrown grapes. Our present author will not disappoint that hope. He has digested his material thoroughly, and has given us a book worth its shelf-room for permanent reference. It is a good exposition of British life and work, thoughtful, critical, well elaborated. Mr. Hoppin is fond of quiet beauty and pleasures, though alive to the sublimer attractions of nature. He writes purely and with a fine insight of his subject. Setting forth to show why our ancestral country should receive more attention from our travelling people, and not be used so much as a mere point of departure for Continental travel, he has well executed this very sensible design.

- 7.—*Works of Charles Dickens.* Globe Edition. *Nicholas Nickleby.* Four volumes in one. 12mo. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

For easy, pleasant reading—inviting type, right size (except a trifle too thick), flexible opening, fair paper—we give this edition of Dickens our preference. Eyesight to us is worth more than any other *diamond*. We are sorry to see the double-columned, microscopic fashion in books coming round again. In the end, it is too expensive, *me experto*. The “Globe Dickens” promises a happy combination of the good points of a book for every body. This duodecimo of more than twelve hundred pages (two volumes would have been better) is firm, elastic, tasteful. The illustrations are excellent. It is too late, we suppose, to criticise Mr. Dickens' swearing so much, by proxy, in his low characters, and higher ones, sometimes. It is lifelike enough, doubtless; but a kind of life which however “artistically” portrayed, is offensive and corrupting.

This Dickens-mania among our publishers may very likely put money into their pockets ; but we augur no good from it either to the taste or morals of our people, while by no means insensible to the better qualities and strong fascination of many of these stories.

- 8.—*Lectures on the Study of History, delivered in Oxford, 1859*—61. By GOLDWIN SMITH, M. A., Regius Professor of Modern History in the University of Oxford. To which is added a Lecture delivered before the New York Historical Society, in December, 1864, on the University of Oxford. 12mo. New York : Harper & Brothers. 1866.

HISTORY is so broad a field, that any book is warmly welcomed which will facilitate a survey of it either as a whole or in any of its parts. Life is too short for any man to gain any very extensive and profound knowledge of general history, except by reading with definite purpose and with method. That method is doubtless the best, which traces the natural development of a subject from its seminal principle onward. But the detection of that principle, and the tracing of its development, are just the problems which the reader desires to know how to solve. The title of this book promises aid in this direction. How well the book redeems the promise, is a question which different readers might answer differently, according to their appreciation of the subject of method in general, and their agreement with the author.

Whether history is a science, whether it is governed by such laws that, the factors being given, the result might be substantially determined beforehand, is a question in debate. Professor Smith rejects the doctrine of the necessarian, yet accepts that of historical progress. In his view, the fact of the moral freedom of man precludes the possibility of a historian's becoming so scientific as to show with tolerable certainty what shall be hereafter. He writes with sharp though brief criticisms upon the theories of those who would ascribe the progress of the race to anything rather than to Christianity. But whether he himself clearly distinguishes between "the law of sin and death," under which man's boasted moral freedom is essentially moral bondage, necessitating in the main a development from bad to worse, and "the law of the spirit of life in Christ Jesus," which frees man from moral bondage and impels him from bad to better ; and that, only when the various forces of this latter law interpenetrate and check and overcome the forces of the former—what his real views are, is not so obvious as it might have been had the entire volume been made up of lectures strictly

appropriate to the title. The book, however, is written in popular style, and is interesting and valuable, not only for its suggestiveness in regard to the philosophy of history, but also for the view it gives of the University of Oxford.

- 9.—*Ecce Deus, Essays on the Life and Doctrine of Jesus Christ.* With Controversial Notes on *Ecce Homo*. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 1867.

HE who read *Ecce Homo* will want to read this companion volume. It is well written, not, as we think, by the author of *Ecce Homo*, nor with so much genius; but in some parts with the same irreverence for the Bible. In the main, it agrees with the views usually regarded orthodox. The chapter on eternal punishment is a very happy grouping of the arguments in favor of the doctrine. There is a perfect rage for Latin titles, and now *Deus Homo* follows in the wake of *Ecce Deus*. The special consideration given to the character and office of the Messiah is a forcible illustration of what men regard the great central doctrine of the Bible. They are still attempting an answer to the question, "Whom do men say that I, the Son of man, am?"

- 10.—*Lange's Commentaries.* Critical, Doctrinal, and Homiletical. The Epistles of James, Peter, John, and Jude. Vol. IX. of the New Testament. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 1867.

DR. SCHAFF, the American editor of this voluminous German serial, has found an able co-laborer for the present volume, in Dr. Isador Mombert, who translates and annotates these shorter epistles. The general characteristics of the work, as explained in our former notices, are maintained in this section of it. The salient points in these apostolic letters, such as the doctrine of James upon good works, the canonicity of the second epistle of Peter, the relation of this epistle to that of Jude, the Johannean doctrine of Christian sinlessness, are handled with care and scholarly fulness. The critical questions thus raised are settled according to the generally accepted view of the church, and, as we think, upon satisfactory grounds. At the same time there is no attempted concealment of the difficulties involved in these fields of inquiry; they are fairly stated, and the reader is referred to the sources where he can examine more at length the opposite conclusions of other investigators.

The eminently practical character of the epistles here presented, their application to the condition and wants of the church in all ages, gives a very great richness to these pages. The different

transatlantic writers of this volume, and their American translator and editor, have brought out affluently the teachings and the literature of this part of holy writ, thus making a noble treasury of truth for the nourishment of the reader. Some of the best minds and maturest Christian experience of the Christian ages have explained and illustrated these general epistles; and it is only necessary to turn these leaves to see how diligently the gleaners have here followed these reapers, gathering whole sheaves of ripe knowledge and holy wisdom into this garner. We answer a question which was lately asked us, when we say in closing, that this series of volumes is quite as well adapted to lay reading and study, as to that of our clerical friends. It ought to have several regular purchasers in each of our churches.

- 11.—*Ministering Children. A Sequel.* BY MARIA LOUISA CHARLES-WORTH. New York: Robert Carter. 1867.

THOSE who read the previous book by this title will be likely to read this. They may not think it any better, but they will find the same admirable and instructive qualities. The Carters' make gain of godliness in a sense in which this is proper; serving the public and the Christian's Master at one and the same time.

- 12.—*Lectures on Natural Theology: Or Nature and the Bible from the same Author.* Delivered before the Lowell Institute, Boston. By PAUL N. CHADBOURNE, A.M., M.D., Prof. of Natural History in Amherst College, etc. New York: G. P. Putnam & Son, 661 Broadway. 1867.

A BOOK at once religious and scientific. The author, a devout and enthusiastic student of God's works is also a devout believer in his word. Prof. Chadbourne has put the Christian public under obligations to him by bringing out these lectures to a larger audience. The publishers have done their part in admirable style.

- 13.—*God's Word Written; The Doctrine of Holy Scripture Explained and Enforced.* By the Rev. EDWARD GARBETT, M. A., Incumbent of Christ Church, Surbeton; Bayle Lecturer for 1861, 1862 and 1863; Select Preacher to the University of Oxford in 1862 and 1863. Am. Tract Society, 28 Cornhill, Boston.

THIS is a reprint from the London Religious Tract Society, and is a very able, direct and succinct re-statement of the argument for the plenary inspiration of the Bible, with such further arguments and illustrations as the times demand. The volume concludes with

a valuable recapitulation and summary, chapter by chapter. An internal argument for the verbal inspiration of the Scriptures, the author thus felicitously states :

"It is possible for us to gather the sense out of the words of the text, and yet find, nevertheless, that the words have a power of their own like the fragrance of some sweet flower that we lay next our hearts. The soul seems to imbibe from contact with the very words a certain indescribable tone and spirit, as if the mind in its prayerful meditations goes into the text, and through the text came into contact with the mind of the inspiring Deity. What Christian man has not repeated the words of a text over and over again, as if they were a strain of sweet music,—a breath fresh from the other and the better world?" p 356.

14.—*Longfellow's Poems Complete*. Diamond Edition. Boston : Ticknor & Fields.

HERE they are, from "Voices of the Night" to "Flower-De-Luce," a wonderful series of titles to volumes and poems, the very reading of which does one good. How finished and chaste and elegant and scholarly a poet this Longfellow was and is ! And here is a French poem addressed to Agassiz, which even Beranger might have been proud of ; though since it is so free and easy in its temperance principles, we are glad it is in its appropriate tongue. We trust the wine sent was in "original packages."

Here from the "Birds of Killingworth" is one of those terrible creatures, which according to the *Atlantic Monthly* once made New England quake with their tread.

"The Parson, too, appeared, a man austere,  
The instinct of whose nature was to kill ;  
The wrath of God he preached from year to year,  
And read with fervor, Edwards on the Will ;  
His fav'rite pastime was to slay the deer  
In summer on some Adirondac hill ;  
E'en now, while walking down the rural lane,  
He lopped the wayside lilies with his cane."

Shade of gentle Harvard ! on what have these professors, that walk the shades of modern Harvard, fed, that their and thy clerical brethren must always throw them into such paroxysms ! Even the golden-tongued Longfellow hath the bitter speech ! Belonging to the clerical class ourselves, we hope we shall be forgiven for quoting a text, that seems possibly applicable :

"And when he saw Him, straightway the spirit tare him ; and he fell on the ground and wallowed foaming." Mark ix 20.

- 15.—*Dickens' Works Illustrated*. David Copperfield and Nicholas Nickleby. Diamond Edition. Boston: Ticknor & Fields. 1867.

VERY fascinating little volumes, just what one wants to take into the country in vacation and read under shade-trees, if he dares risk his eyes for such a feat. The illustrations, by S. Eytinge, Jr., are full of truth and action, and equal to anything of the kind we have ever seen. We propose to regale ourselves again with these creations of Dickens' genius; although, as already intimated, we fear that some of the diamond points of the printer may leave pangs in our eyes.

- 16.—*Annual of Scientific Discovery: or Year-book of Facts and Science for 1866 and 1867*. Edited by SAMUEL KNEELAND, A. M., M. D., Fellow of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1867.

ALL who would keep up with the progress of scientific discovery must own and study such a volume as this. It is prepared with apparent accuracy and care, and has a full index. David A. Wells, U. S. Com. of Revenue, who has edited the previous issues of the work, introduces it with a prefatory note; and his portrait embellishes the volume; the face of a man who would look sharply after figures and facts, or we are deceived.

- 17.—*The Market Assistant*. Containing a brief description of Every Article of Human Food sold in the Public Markets of the Cities of New York, Boston, Philadelphia and Brooklyn; Including the various Domestic and Wild Animals, Poultry, Game, Fish, Vegetables, Fruits, etc., with many curious Incidents and Anecdotes. By THOMAS F. DE FOE, author of "The Market Book," etc. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

AFTER this long descriptive title-page, little remains to be said about the volume itself. Mr. De Foe in his meat-stand is presented in the frontispiece, sketched by himself. And never clergyman with robes and bands ready to be daguerreotyped, appeared more self-complacent. As a "market assistant," we do not regard the book as having especial value; but, as a compendium of useful and interesting information, it certainly possesses many good qualities.



18. — *The Open Polar Sea: A Narrative of a Voyage of Discovery towards the North Pole, in the Schooner United States.* By Dr. I. I. HAYES. 8vo. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

THOSE who followed Dr. Kane among icebergs and through Arctic winters, will be sure to want this volume. There is a fascination, a contagion for adventurers and readers on the Arctic Ocean. One book or expedition only prepares the way for another; and it is highly creditable to the scientific and commercial enterprise of our country, as well as to the energy and daring of our discoverers, that we have followed up the idea of an open polar sea with so much perseverance to success. The declarations of Morton have become confirmations with Hayes. The problem is solved.

In this volume, the story is told with all the witching excitement of the best Waverly novel. The labor of organizing the expedition, the departure, the icebergs, fogs, snow storms and breakers, the ice-pack, the winter quarters and long winter night, dog-teams, reindeer and bears, Arctic midnight, a new summer, the terrible sledge expedition, and the Open Sea at last—it is all intensely interesting. The book would energize a sluggard. Dr. Hayes is a good descriptive writer, and his style, as well as facts, carries the reader. Here he writes out mainly the story. His contributions to science, drawn out in official reports, are in the hands of the Smithsonian Institution, and it is to be hoped will some day be published, though there seems to be much delay about it.

The work is ornamented by a very fine steel engraving of the author's likeness, and nine illustrations with thirty "tail-pieces."

- 19.—*Rural Studies, with Hints for Country Places.* By the Author of "My Farm at Edgewood." pp. 295. New York: Charles Scribner & Co.

ANY thing from the pen of Ik Marvel is well worth reading, and these essays, many of which have appeared already in the serial press, are of special interest and value. It is an occurrence of every day in the year, to spoil what might have been a very beautiful place, by building the house first and making it immovable, and then consulting the landscape gardener or his book; whereas this should always be the first thing. To locate a house properly is one of the fine arts. Or if it has been already located it is a fine art to give it the proper horticultural embellishments, of lawn, tree, shrub and flower. No other outlay is a hundredth part so productive in making a home beautiful. Mr. Mitchell has a fine taste and judgment in this direction, and moreover has made the thing a study:

his book, therefore, is of special value to those who have homes to embellish or are expecting to have, while it is full of entertainment and instruction for all who love the country. A growing love of horticultural ornament is among the most gratifying indications of the advancing civilization of our country. Our wide forests supply trees and shrubs in the largest and richest variety, and we have land enough. It is a great piece of folly to pay an enormous price for a quarter or an eighth of an acre of land, and put a house on it close to the noisy, dusty street, and shut in by other houses, near the centre of things, when by going a short distance a man can have two or three acres, furnishing ample room for shade trees and lawn, and fruit, and for the blue bird, robin and wren to build and sing. We would like to say a good deal more, but if our readers will get Mr. Mitchell's book, that will be better still.

20.—*Classic Baptism.* An Inquiry into the Meaning of the word BAPTIZO, as determined by the Usage of Classical Greek Writers. By JAMES W. DALE, Pastor of the Media Presbyterian Church, Delaware County, Pa. 8vo. pp. 354. Boston: Draper & Halliday. Philadelphia: Smith, English & Co. Chicago: S. C. Griggs & Co. 1867.

A WORK of great research, scholarly fidelity, and immense labor. Going back of all lexicons and commentaries, the author has consulted the original sources, where the meaning of a word is determined by its use. In this labor, Mr. Dale has consulted and quoted, with references to work and page, thirty two Greek writers in their use of βάπτω, and thirty seven in their use of βαπτίζω. Twelve Latin writers are quoted to show the use of *tingo*, and seventeen to show the use of *mergo*, and about fifty eminent English authors to illustrate the force of the English related words. Every known case of classical usage is adduced, and the quotations cover a period of about a thousand years. The words dip, plunge, immerse, immerge, submerge, whelm, bury, drown, sprinkle, dye, imbue, and all those other that commonly go into a discussion of this question, are analyzed most sharply and delicately in their structure, import and use.

Mr. Dale takes up this question of the last two or three centuries, with the opening inquiry, what results the Baptists have reached since they claim to have arrived at the absolute truth. They claim to have demonstrated that βαπτίζω has but one meaning in all Greek literature; that βαπτίζω and βάπτω have precisely the same meaning, with the one exception of dyeing: that they both express the definite act and mode, to dip. To prove these claims many leading

Baptist writers are cited, by which it is seen that they differ much among themselves as to whether baptism is an act, or a mode, or a state. The Baptists are allowed to speak freely for themselves, about twenty are cited, and are seen to be far from a unit in their claimed demonstration. Mr. Dale's treatment of Baptist authorities is comprehensive, liberal, critical and dissecting, and their claims to demonstration are thrown out on the showing of their own want of harmony among themselves. Their one meaning to βαπτίζω, definite, clear and precise, and translatable by the one word, immerse, is shown to be a declaration only and not a demonstration.

All this is preliminary, occupying about one hundred pages, and before the author comes to his investigations proper within the classic field. As the unwarrantable conclusions and unfortunate confusion among themselves are attributable very much to the error of the Baptists in making βαπτω and βαπτίζω synonyms, the first step of our author is to show "that they are radically different in meaning." Almost sixty pages are given to the import of βαπτω as shown in the classics. pp. 137—195. These pages are a beautiful specimen of scholarly, controversial and kind writing, approximating to what is so often miscalled exhaustive. This subject, so dry in one sense, the author gives sprinkled, and even at times, immersed in the good humor of his nature and style. His conclusions on the word, βαπτω, are that it means to dip, moisten, wash, dye, stain, paint, gild, temper and tincture, with more of dyeing than dipping, though ten or twelve words are required to render all its classic meaning into English. So this word must be rejected as the same in import as βαπτίζω, first because no one word can express it, as the Baptists claim for the other, and secondly, because it is radically different. Mr. Dale then proceeds to devote the rest of his noble volume, one hundred and fifty pages, to the meaning of βαπτίζω.

Immerse, *mergo*, is outlined in its import by quotations most abundant from ancient and modern writers. Then several meanings are shown to pertain to βαπτίζω, from the very varied and abundant quotations from scores of Greek authors.

1. Intusposition, or condition of the object without regard to the action baptizing it. 2. Any act, or number of acts, securing this condition of intusposition, constitute a baptizing action, while the baptism is in the condition of the object, and not in the agency. 3. βαπτίζω is without limitation of power, object, or duration, as the sea baptized the shore, the sun himself in the ocean. 4. Some baptisms influence the objects baptized, as "the soul being baptized

very much by the body," Alex. Aphrodisias. 5. Some are baptized for an influence. As, "One, saved by the voyage, whom it was better to baptize," i. e., drown. 6. Baptisms without intusposition or mersion. As, "Baptized by such a multitude of evils," "Baptized by an anger," "Misfortunes baptize us," "They do not baptize the people by taxes," Diod. Siculus. "The events still baptized you," "Baptized by diseases," "Baptized by the affairs of life." And many more cases from the Old Greek Writers Mr. Dale quotes, where the Baptist notion of immersion would find a dry baptism indeed, in "wantonness," "debts of fifty millions," "diseases," "evils" and "taxes." 7. Physical mersion is not necessary to baptism. As, one may be baptized with wine—be drunk, or by any opiate, or by any trouble. That which brings the object under a controlling influence is said, by the Greeks, to baptize it.

"Give what explanation you will, the stubborn fact, the truly important thing remains; that the Greeks daily effected baptisms by a draught of wine, by a bewildering question, and by droppings from an opiate. Accumulate around these baptisms metaphor, figure, picture, and what not, I make my argument with finger pointed to the cup, the question, and the opiate drop, and say, the old Greeks baptized, through a thousand years, by such things as these." p. 79.

8. Baptism is not a definite act of any kind, as to immerse or dip, sprinkle or pour. No form of action is justly involved in any proper inquiry into the import of baptism. Baptism, in its deepest meaning, is a complete change of condition, physical, mental, moral, or ceremonial. The element in which, and the mode, are of no account. The condition of the object or person baptized is all of the classic idea of baptism. Completeness in the changed condition of the subject, with or without a physical envelopment, that is baptism.

This book must take its place preëminent in the alcove as an arbiter among scholarly disputants on this question. It comes in as Blucher at Waterloo, and this *bellum philologicum* ought to cease.

21.—*Bible Pictures; or Life Sketches of Life Truths.* By GEORGE B. IDE, D. D. Boston: Gould & Lincoln. 1867.

HERE are twenty sketches, lively and familiar as an address, on as many interesting biblical scenes. The style is the flowing, open style of the more popular form, and is easy for the reader. By such volumes many of the more practical thoughts of the preacher work out, through the press, among the masses. Of course we read, this warm weather, the chapter on Deep Sea

Fishing, but were surprised to catch carp, pike and bass, in the lake of Gennesareth. Did they furnish the good haul for Peter when "the net brake?"

- 22.—*The Book of Proverbs, in an American Version, with an Introduction and Explanatory Notes.* By JOSEPH MUENSCHER, D. D. Printed at the Western Episcopalian Office, Gambier, Ohio. 1866.

WE welcome almost any exegetical work on the Old Testament. It has been too much neglected by the writers of biblical handbooks. Specially may this be said of the Book of Proverbs. Glances at this work of Dr. Muenschler satisfy us that he has done a good thing for the laity, as well as the clergy. The new translation was needed in places, and throws fresh light.

- 23.—*History of Congregationalism, from about A. D. 250, to the present time.* By GEORGE PUNCHARD. Second Edition, Rewritten and greatly enlarged. Vol. III. pp. 455. New York: Hurd & Houghton. 1867.

It was a pleasure to us to give a very favorable notice of the two preceding volumes of this most excellent work, Vol. V., pp. 413-14.

Mr. Punchard has shown great patience in research, and great scholarly accuracy and zeal in gathering his material. He has been in no hot haste to publish an uncertain work, and time and labor he has put far below fidelity and fulness in the handling of his great theme. It is in the light of such protracted and careful study in authorship that we get a new meaning in the proverb: Beware of the man of one book. We should be very slow to contradict Mr. Punchard in this field of ecclesiastical history.

This volume opens with the distinct separation of the Puritans from the English church, 1575 and following. A careful outline of the head of the Brownists is given, and of many of his co-martyrs, Copping, Thacker, Gibson and others; and of the leading Congregationalists we have minute and exceedingly interesting accounts, as of Barrowe and Greenwood, their imprisonment, examination, sufferings, execution and writings. Two chapters are given to that distinguished martyr, Penry. The strength of mind, biblical knowledge and firmness of those men, and their broad, deep principles of church government and Christian liberty are a marvel to us, and a sorry thing it is for our church that they must wait so long to have their history written.

After the death of Penry, Mr. Punchard takes his reader through

the last days of Elizabeth and of Burleigh, the friend of the Puritans. Then come James I. and the Hampton Court Conference, John Robinson, the first Congregational church in England, the Serooby Manor, and flight to Holland, with fast following, mingled and stirring events in the early history of our order, down to the emigration to America. On the settlement and opening of New England, Mr. Punchard lingers a little till he finds that our Congregational fathers have founded a State "memorable in the annals of the world" with "a name and a fame which are likely to endure while the world shall stand," and there he leaves them.

But we hope only for a time. It remains yet to be told, by a careful historian, how much of the thinking and writing and working to found the colonies of the North and secure independence and establish the Federal Government, was done by this same Congregational church. Also it remains yet to be told how this church stands related to the benevolent and Christian enterprises that now characterize the age. Particularly should we like to see a bibliographical history of Congregationalism, that it might be seen how much our libraries are indebted to this church for its theological and religious, educational, civil, historical, literary, scientific and other works. We think not a few who now flout at the Puritans would find empty shelves in their alcoves, if not empty heads also, if all the volumes written by those despised ones were withdrawn. "There was a little city, and few men within it, and there came a great king against it and besieged it, and built great bulwarks against it. Now there was found in it a poor wise man; and he by his wisdom delivered the city," and we wish Mr. Punchard to write one more volume and tell us about it.

- 24.—*Speeches and Addresses.* By HENRY WINTER DAVIS, of Maryland. Preceded by a sketch of his Life, Public Services and Character, being an Oration of the Hon. J. A. J. CRESSWELL, U. S. Senator from Maryland. New York: Harper & Brothers. 1867.

HENRY WINTER DAVIS will one day be regarded as one of the greatest ornaments and honors, as he was one of the most loyal patriots of his native State. "Of Maryland!" Yes, of the true, faithful Maryland that loved the Union; not of the false, treacherous Baltimore stamp, that our Massachusetts soldiers encountered on their way to the relief of Washington. An orator, ready, quick and vehement, sometimes a little florid and artificial, he always magnetized his audience, and held them at his fingers' ends; a lawyer, well versed in the technicalities of his profession, skillful in

chopping logic ; a political leader, of a keen sense of right and wrong, loyal to the right, and willing to make sacrifices for it ; a man not infallible, but never to be bought or sold ; this is the man whose speeches are here gathered. It will do an aspiring young man good to read them, and to imitate their author.

- 25.—*Recent British Philosophy.* By DAVID MASSON. New York : D. Appleton & Co. 1866.

THIS book is written in a clear style, and contains much valuable thought and information. The substance of it was delivered in lectures, at the Royal Institution of Great Britain.

- 26.—*Life and Works of Gotthold Ephraim Lessing.* From the German of Adolf Stahr. By E. I. EVANS. Philadelphia : D. Appleton & Co. Two volumes. Boston : Wm. V. Spencer. 1866.

It takes this biographer a long while to get under way ; but the book increases in interest toward the end. Whether Lessing was such a benefactor to man, or his native country, as here claimed, we very much doubt. That his influence upon its literature, and that of the world, has been very marked, all must admit. The translator seems to have done his work well, and the book is brought out in admirable style.

- 27.—*History of the Christian Church.* Ancient Christianity. Vols. I., II. and III. Rev. P. SCHAFF, D. D. C. Scribner & Co. 1867.

THIS is the best church history we have ever attempted to read. It is readable, learned, carefully prepared, candid and independent. Dr. Schaff has put American scholars in this department under lasting obligation to himself.

- 28.—*Studies in the Gospels.* By Archbishop TRENCH. C. Scribner & Co. 1867.

THIS learned divine is at the head of biblical critics ; and this is a collection of expository lectures upon many of the difficult subjects in the New Testament. It is curious, critical, suggestive, and can not be read without advantage.

- 29.—*The Redeemer : A Sketch of the History of Redemption.* By EDMOND DE PRESSENSÉ. Translated from the second edition. By Rev. J. H. Myers, D. D. Boston : American Tract Society. 1867.

WE have here twelve chapters, beginning with the Fall and ending with Jesus Christ as King. It treats of the promise of redemp-



tion, and the preparation for the coming of Christ among the nations, Jewish and heathen, and also of the nature of our Lord and his plan in coming; his teachings and miracles and sacrificial work. It is less labored, but more systematic than Edwards' History of Redemption, and has the advantage of a lively style, as if made up of addresses, but the author tells us it was first written for the press, and not for an audience.

30.—*Ornithology and Oölogy of New England*, etc., etc. By EDWARD A. SAMUELS, Curator of Zoölogy in Massachusetts State Cabinet. Boston: Nichols and Noyes. 1867.

AUDUBON's splendid work was never within popular reach, and Wilson and Nuttall are out of print. There was a vacancy, a need, in this department of our natural history popularized, and therefore this work of Mr. Samuels is timely.

A bulky octavo of nearly six hundred pages well illustrated with life-like and accurate plates of all our more noted birds, and the eggs of many of them drawn in the natural size, the volume is tempting to the eye. To the reader who loves nature, it is fascinating. Mr. Samuels has a good descriptive style, and he gives minute and enlarged views of all our woodland favorites. Their songs and sounds, habits, nests and rearing of young, with their times and seasons and localities, are sketched in a delightful way for the common reader, while the scientific ornithologist finds the claims of science honored in the structure of the book.

In one or two instances, where Mr. Samuels has followed others, he has been misled, as in speaking of the Pinnated Grouse or Prairie Chicken. This bird is found in New England only on Martha's Vineyard, and one or two other islands, and so the author had not been able to study its habits.

He quotes Wilson as saying: "Old gunners have reported that they have been known to trespass upon patches of buckwheat, and pick up the grains." A Western farmer would smile at that statement, when they are such a serious enemy to all his grain fields, and often visit them in flocks of hundreds. "The flights of grouse are short." After the coveys are broken up, in October or November, we have seen them make flights of many miles when put up, while at sunrise and sunset they fly back and forth from three to twelve miles between the open prairies, where they delight to spend the night, and the grain fields.

Some of the plates are very spirited and true to life; and we can not refrain from speaking specially of the group of Spruce Partridges, or Canada Grouse, on p. 378. It takes us back to the

forest between the Magalloway and the Middle Dam on the Androscoggin, where we first saw and ate this beautiful bird. Its flesh was sweet and tender then, in September, though commonly bitter later in the year, from the spruce bud, from the eating of which it takes its name. Of the utility of the robin, so well argued on pp. 155-163, we are profoundly sceptical. But we are writing in the strawberry season, and our specimen berries are sadly mutilated by this quarrelsome, imperious, sharp-toned thing.

Mr. Samuels has most happily combined the scientific and popular in his book. This is an admirable feature. And he has carried the oölogy of some birds with much interest farther than any writer whom we can recall.

We are exceedingly glad that our author has thus put the feathery tribes of New England and a fascinating style of ornithology within the reach of our young people. It opens to them a study and recreation at the same time; following it will improve and make delicate their taste by such constant and varied familiarity with nature, while the general effect will be good physically, mentally and morally.

31.—*The Jesuits in North America in the Seventeenth Century.* By FRANCIS PARKMAN, author of "Pioneers of France in the New World." Boston: Little, Brown & Co. 1867.

THE fields of literary research are constantly on the increase, like our national domain, and Mr. Parkman has in this case opened a very inviting and long-neglected one. His History of the Conspiracy of Pontiac, and of the Pioneers of France in the New World, led him naturally to this volume, as also to the next now in promise: the French Discovery and Occupation of the Valley of the Mississippi.

Mr. Parkman is to be greatly commended for his patient, faithful and painstaking discovery and examination of original documents. We can fancy the immense amount of manuscript, old letters, journals and memoranda, in miserable handwriting and worse French, that he has overhauled, noted and abstracted. Monasteries, convents, Jesuits archives, State departments, the files of the De Propaganda, and Antiquarian Libraries must have had their venerable dust not a little disturbed.

How much easier for our author to have made his facts as he went along, like our most voluminous and popular tale writers, and escaped all this dust and drudgery, and with a richer pocket too.

This volume has an interesting and labored Introduction of about seventy pages, dividing, naming and locating the Indians of the seventeenth century in New England, the Canadas, and the North

West of the great lakes. In this part of his work he gives account of their houses, fortifications, habits, arts, trades, feasts, politics, superstitions and religion. It is the best summary of this Indian matter that we have ever read, in the same space. The volume proper, as a history of the missionary Jesuits in this country, opens at Quebec in 1634. Thence, and to the end, it is a wilderness romance, all true and real. The Jesuit system is outlined theoretically, and then illustrated practically. We have the wigwam, the Indian scholars, summer and winter encampments, forest life with its perils, savage incantations and conversions, the reverses of the missions and their enthusiasm, visions, tricks and miracles. While the book is a history of religious labors, it is at the same time a treasury of Indian history, antiquities and customs, and very few readers will begin to read it who do not finish it. It fascinates while it instructs, and we shall await the next work with a deeper interest. The volume furnishes a lesson for our modern deists that ought to profit them. Some are now saying and teaching, indeed they call it often preaching, that we can have a Christianity without Christ; a revelation without inspiration, and even religion without God. This is a free religion, a liberal Christianity of the radical wing, a natural religion. In this book Mr. Parkman shows what and how much this means, and so what these men, wiser than the holy men of old, who spake as they were moved of the Holy Ghost, would give us. We quote:—

“Close examination makes it evident that the primitive Indian's idea of a Supreme Being was a conception no higher than might have been expected. The moment he began to contemplate this object of his faith, and sought to clothe it with attributes, it became finite, and commonly ridiculous.” “In the primitive Indian's conception of a God the idea of moral good has no part.” “In no Indian language could the early missionaries find a word to express the idea of God.” “The primitive Indian, yielding his untutored homage to One All-pervading, and Omnipotent Spirit, is a dream of the poets, rhetoricians, and sentimentalists.” “Would the Iroquois, left undisturbed to work out their own destiny, ever have emerged from the savage state? Advanced as they were beyond most other American tribes, there is no indication whatever of a tendency to overpass the confines of a wild hunter and warrior life.—*Introd.* pp. 65-89.

Indeed, the world by wisdom knows not God, and this kind of wisdom that reduces religion to a naked deism, is not yet extinct. What it would do for us this volume shows. These same wise men, deists, scorn the idea that by a divine and unerring inspiration, “life and immortality are brought to light in the Gospel.” They think the light of nature and of reason sufficient. We commend

them to a study of the experiment, recorded in this volume, of their predecessors in the same theory.

"The primitive Indian believed in the immortality of the soul, but he did not always believe in a state of future rewards and punishment. . . . In the general belief there was but one land of shades for all alike. The spirits, in form and feature as they had been in life, wended their way through dark forests to the villages of the dead, subsisting on bark and rotten wood. On arriving, they sat all day in the crouching position of the sick, and, when night came, hunted the shades of animals with the shades of bows and arrows, among the shades of trees and rocks. For all things, animate and inanimate, were alike immortal, and all passed together to the gloomy country of the dead."—*Introd.* 80-11.

31.—MISCELLANEOUS. By the American Tract Society, New York. *Paul Venner; or the Forge and the Pulpit*. One of those fascinating stories, in which the facts of every day life are made to teach lessons of gentleness, industry and piety. So taught, of course Paul Venner, the blacksmith boy, comes to honor, and "is now known as the learned and dearly loved president of a celebrated college." *The Bible Reader's Help: Pastoral Reminiscences*, by the late Rev. MARTIN MOORE; *A Mother's Legacy*; *George Wayland, the Little Medicine Carrier*; *The Cinnamon Isle Boy*; *Times of Knox and Mary Stuart*. These small volumes are good additions to our juvenile reading. The *Times of Knox* is written in the lively, diary style, full of incidents, facts, and conversation, and must be sure to carry the reader along through those stirring days and events. By the Presbyterian Board of Publication. *The New Boat*. Our boys must read this. *The Cloud and the Sunbeam*; *Two Terms at Olney*; *The Little Priest*. This is by the Rev. W. P. BREED, one of the best writers for this Board; *The Martyr's Daughter*; *The Little Norwegian* and *The Young Woodcutter*. By the American Tract Society, Boston. *Friendly Words to Fellow Pilgrims*. By JAMES WILLIAM KIMBALL. Mr. Kimball has made his initials familiar to the Christian public through the columns of the religious newspaper press. He is a man of very decided opinions, and often expresses them very clearly and forcibly. We think this little volume calculated to do good. *Glimpses of West Africa, with Sketches of Missionary Labor*. By Rev. SAMUEL J. WHITON. We like this style of book: fact, incident, history, geography, Christian work and the lives of good men, all worked in together, and all known to be true. This book pleases us for this reason. *The Sister's Story. Rich and Humble: or the Memoir of Bertha Grant*. By OLIVER OPTIC. Boston: Lee & Shepard. 1867.

The name of the author will carry this interesting story everywhere among our young people, for whom it was written. The writer knows how to tell a story well, and the little folk will not soon forget him. Works of Robert Carter & Brothers: *Binding the Sheaves, Cripple Dan*. By ANDREW WHITGIFT. *Father Clement. A Roman Catholic Story. The Story of Martin Luther*, edited by MISS WHATELY. *Wanderings in Bible Lands*. By the author of the "Schönberg-Cotta Family." *Heaven Opened*. A Selection from the Correspondence of Mrs. Mary Winslow. Edited by her Son, OCTAVIUS WINSLOW, D. D. *The Wanderings in Bible Lands*, by a well known and graceful pen, is full of light for any reader or student of the Bible. Not technical and professional, like ministerial books and helps on this theme, the ordinary scriptural reader will enjoy the volume. *Heaven Opened* is a book that ought to be much read and loved. It is more like the "good books" of our earlier days, that helped our sainted parents and aged friends into glory. The books of this House can be trusted by the devout followers of Christ. *The Church Hymn Book*. A. D. F. Randolph, New York. J. P. Brown, Burlington, Iowa. Root & Cady, Chicago. 1867. Seven hundred and ten hymns, followed by one hundred and fifty tunes, with the usual Indexes, and one of tunes and hymns as adapted to each other. The paper and type are good, as the form, and the page is welcome to the eye. It will be difficult to find more of the choice hymns and tunes that Christians love to use in worship, in the same compass. Mr. Slater shows an excellent selecting and condensing power.

---

## ARTICLE X.

### THE ROUND TABLE.

WHO AND WHERE. "Who publish your Congregational works, and where are they kept?" It was a humbling, mortifying question, and thinking we ought to do penance unto humility, we replied: They are not published anywhere, and they are not kept by anybody. Our denominational authors have been obliged to go into the market and sell their manuscripts as if they were strangers in the home of the Pilgrims. Their volumes have been left to a simple trade interest for sale and circulation, and the expositions and defenses of our peculiar tenets have gone out into the world like orphans and foundlings.

We take up the catalogue of the Episcopal Society for the Promotion of Evangelical Knowledge, and a hasty perusal of a part of it, guided by titles only, shows us about sixty works of their own devoted to their peculiar denominational features. A similar notice of the catalogue of the Baptist Publication Society shows us about forty of the same kind. The books of this class published by these societies is probably two or threefold the numbers specified, and the Presbyterians and Methodists have the same wise and energetic policy. An author of their own ranks, and defending their faith and polity or peculiarities, is furnished a standing within their own lines.

Mr. Punchard's History of Congregationalism, Bertha and her Baptism, Dr. Dexter's Congregationalism, the Papers and Records of the National Council, and a hundred other denominational works issued within a half century, should have been thrown off at the press and offered on the counter of a Congregational Publishing House. Instead of that they have found as many publishers as they had authors, and now lie about loose, like the leaves of the Sybil.

Not only so, but the same is true of our undenominational works on practical godliness, in memoir and essay, narrative and fiction. Organized boards of other branches of the church, and private enterprise of the dollar and cent aim have been the medium of communication for our most worthy and sterling authors. And because we have shown as little interest in saving our old authors as in cherishing with a warm feeling our modern ones, we have lost already much of their dust through lack of an urn in which to deposit it. Congregationalists can build churches and colleges and seminaries, union and even sectarian for others, but have not yet a fireproof closet five feet square in which to make safe any old record or relic from Scrooby, Leyden or Plymouth. Congregational money keeps scores of Hoe's latest patent presses going day and night for others, but no organization of the church, so far as we know, owns a pound of small pica. They owned the first press, and printed the first work on the continent, and ought now to be doing in this line more as a denomination than any other in America. It is to our mortification and reproach that the authors we have mentioned should be obliged to enter the literary world as private adventurers.

OUR APRIL NUMBER. Our friend Tilton of the *Independent*, who, if he has not that Grecian cut profile which the *Post* attributes to him, has yet the Toledo cut to his pen, writing with the truest kind of abandon in slashing cavalry style, gave our April number nearly a column among his literary notices. We were more than satisfied, both with his likes and his dislikes. He thought our Arti-

cle on *The Black Man*, just the thing. We think he is a good judge in that department. He thought our Article on *The Atlantic Monthly* very much aside from the mark; a sign that we are yet in "the Middle Ages." Here we think his judgment at fault. In theology we are several centuries back of mediæval times. We confess it. Our motto is *Sanctos ausus recludere fontes*. It will take more than 'three months' to bring this department of the Review down to the standard of our cotemporary. In fact, we do not intend to come down. We hope, however, to be always ready to strike hands with men of whatever persuasion or complexion or age in all proper efforts at reform.

*The Round Table*, too, from which we have received the most appreciative notices, hitherto, resenting our crowding into its peculiar domain, that of finding fault with things in the world of letters, takes us severely to task for what we said of Dr. Holmes's misrepresentations of orthodox Christians. We can only refer the editor to an extended notice of "Dr. Johns," in which the same view was taken by that periodical of Ik Marvel's portraiture of the same class. And we say, if for *his* representations Ik Marvel deserved censure, a thousand times more Dr. Holmes!

By the way, we find the following in our portfolio, which may as well take its place in this connection:

LOOKING AT HOLME (S).

"I am afraid I shall have to square accounts by writing one more story, with a wicked physician in it. I have been looking in vain for such a one to serve as a model." *Dr. Holmes before the Mass. Med. Society.*

I have been prying round about,  
Inspecting people lean and stout,  
To make a reg'lar villain out,  
And mark him in my book like Cain.  
Among the doctors all in vain  
Are my labor and my pain:  
Sure, our profession's free from stain;  
Wherefore 'Stoker?'s very plain.

We're glad to learn, immac'late Doctor,  
Of morals pure, high priest and proctor,  
That in your guild's whole warp and filling,  
You can not find a downright villain!  
A hint or so may help your knowledge;  
Near Cambridge bridge there is a college;  
Have you forgotten, gentle fibster,  
The gibbet of Professor Webster?



*De mortuis*, if you reply,  
 Looking affronted, curt and stern,  
 Then to the quick let us return.  
 The eye can never see the eye :  
 A physiological fact you know.  
 To find the man no further go !  
 Neath Harvard's classic shades he roams ;  
 Try introspection ; *look at Holme (s) !*

NOT PARALLEL CASES. De Quincey, in his acute historical criticism of "the Cæsars," with his usual sharpness looks into the causes of the terrible and utterly indiscribable corruption of the Romans in Italy, as early as the last of the Julian emperors, A. D. 68. The first and chief source of this deterioration from the old Republican virtue, he finds in the almost total change of population which had come in on the heels of the revolutionary devastation of the late times. In a single century, almost every masculine and noble trait of the nation had sunk down into an effeminate dissoluteness paralleled by nothing but the Babylon of Belshazzar. This was not the apostasy of the Roman stock so much as the importation of foreign races. "Not one man in six," in Nero's day, was probably of native descent. Blackwell, quoted by De Quincey, tells us : "Those of the greatest and truly Roman spirit had been murdered in the field by Julius Cæsar : the rest were now massacred in the city by his son and successors ; in their room came Syrians, Cappadocians, Phrygians, and other enfranchised slaves from the conquered nations." These took the place of the former inhabitants, filling Rome and the whole peninsula with Asiatic people and manners. "In a single generation," says De Quincey, "Rome became almost transmuted into a baser metal. . . The taint of Asiatic luxury and depravity," nameless vices of Antioch and Alexandria displaced the sterner morals of the Tiber. The effect was like murrain among sheep. Social and domestic virtue, none too exemplary for some generations precedent, absolutely perished. When the Emperor Augustus compelled one of his nobles to give up his young wife, in most delicate circumstances, to become a royal bride, what could be expected universally but unlimited excesses ? Our author says, that "for the first four hundred years of Rome, not one divorce had been granted or asked, although the statute which allowed of this indulgence had always been in force." Others place the first Roman divorce in the year of the city 520 ; an almost incredible fact, on either chronology, yet the general truth of the statement is undeniable. But now, parties married and were unmarried to suit the whim or the profit of the moment. A woman's

fortune went with her by law, and sold her to successive husbands yearly and oftener, in numerous instances. After this "we need little wonder at the assassinations, poisonings, and forging of wills, which then laid waste the domestic life of the Romans."

Not further to pursue this historical inquiry, what we have written is enough to suggest a thought concerning our own national prospects. At first sight, there seems to be a strong resemblance between the picture thus drawn and ourselves. We are going through great organic changes; some, as the *London Times*, insist that these are rapidly revolutionary. But whatever they may amount to, we think they are not in the direction of Cæsarism. Immense accessions of foreign immigrants are changing very much the quality of our population, and certainly for the worse. Our manners and morals are becoming shockingly "Asiatic," in the large cities, if not in the rural districts. The early republican virtue and piety have sadly fallen off. We concede the melancholy facts. Yet, we do not feel disposed to accept any such conclusions as that we are going down the grade which swept the Roman power and civilization into ruin. There is not sufficient likeness in the cases to justify this deduction, while there is enough to arrest the mind, and to point a very serious warning to our countrymen.

Our foreign population, as a mass, are vitating to our social and national life. But not as in Rome, they come to blend themselves with an enlightened and Christian people. The Rome of the Cæsars was religiously divided between utter atheism and a maudlin superstition. Intellectually it was a desert. De Quincey gives an illustration of this, that while the whole world was ransacked, under imperial orders and bounties for the strangest animals for the conflicts of the amphitheatres, where tens of thousands were exhibited and slaughtered annually, Roman authorship does not furnish a book on Natural History after the age of Pliny, though the best opportunities were thus afforded for these studies. We stand at the opposite pole from such mental and spiritual torpidity. Our social condition is not a cess-pool to turn every thing to corruption which is flung into it. Hence, with a due vigilance, we may hope to elevate the material, which is coming in upon us, to a higher level, instead of subsiding to its lowness. Popish subserviency, continental materialistic infidelity, and the spread of domestic license are our worst demoralizers. But we have an invasive and an aggressive Christianity girding itself anew for the close grapple with these infernal principalities and powers. The emancipated slaves which also flooded Rome were as debauched by every kind of vice as were their masters. Ours, if uneducated, are not rotten to the heart

with crime. While the freedmen of Rome sunk her civilization into an Oriental barbarism of sensuality and cruelty, our freedmen stand ready to be converted into, it may be, the saviours of the Republic.

It strengthens our argument to note that, so early as the reigns of Hadrian and the Antonines, A. D., 130—180, the Christian religion was making itself felt as a purifying force, even in that weltering sea of Italian depravity. Its traces are seen in the efforts of those emperors to mitigate the atrocities of the public games and shows. The valuation of humanity was rising when these reforms were undertaken, shielding men, so far forth, from the degradation and barbarity of these fightings with one another and with the wild beasts of the arena. Our author ascribes this to "the contagion of Christian standards and sentiments then beginning to pervade and ventilate the atmosphere of society in its higher and philosophic regions." The inference is that, if in those circumstances, Christianity could do any thing to improve the horrid customs of an immemorial paganism, it can surely do for us, if faithfully used and applied, all that is necessary to fuse into a friendly whole the discordant and the malignant elements of our population, and to leaven it with the righteousness and the freedom which, from the first, have theoretically been our birthright.

BEHIND THE INDIANS. Some of our profound thinkers, progressive beyond all biblical limits, have dispensed with the creation of man, and developed him from the monkey. Yet others, greatly gifted with an inner sight of things, are learned and powerful spiritists, and all the ghostly world is subject to their rap and beck, single or in pairs. These are the men of "progress," thought and discovery, pioneers of the race who, in their Jehu gig, leave the rest of the world behind, old fogies and foot-pads. But it is a little singular that the North American Indians knew all about these discoveries and this wonderful progress of modern *savans*, long before white men came to this country. They had the "development theory" of man from the animal in far better state than our modern scientists. These tell us that man sprung from the ape, and they almost prove it by specimens. The theory is good for some among us, since they are evidently quite imitative, apish in habit, manner and opinion. Yet others show other animal traits, and so an animal pedigree. Now the Indian theory of development covers all kinds of men, and so is more philosophic than this of the modern theorists. Mr. Parkman in his recent work, the *Jesuits in North America*, says:—

"A belief prevails, vague, but perfectly apparent, that men themselves owe their first parentage to beasts, birds, or reptiles, as bears, wolves, tortoises, or cranes." "Each Indian was supposed to inherit something of the nature of the animal whence he sprung."—*Introd.* p. 68.

Our men of science in the apine line must go back to our Indians for the supplement, or rather complement of their theory. Some men are evidently not developed from apes. They are original grizzlies, savage and solitary. Others are foxy, and of vulpine descent, full of low cunning and trick. Some are quick of eye and motion, with a soft graceful hand, and gloved claws, feline surely in their pre-existent ancestry. Some of our fat office-holders, we suppose, sprung from the tortoise family, and our expressmen from pigeons and antelopes. Those who live for dress, and in gay colors, and before the public, sprung from butterflies, the peacock, and bird of paradise. The Indian theory systematized and connected us perfectly with an appropriate parentage in the preëxistent world.

We like this notion better than the modern and partial reproduction of it, as more comprehensive and more discriminating, and having more of a show of common sense in it when we look at men. For the origin of some people is perfectly obvious. And quite as obvious it is that they did not spring from monkeys.

Such a scheme of preëxistence, moreover, is worthy to be studied together with the one now before the public. We think the Indian theory could be made to help the other into favor if united with it; and illustrative specimens could be cited, as the bovine, ursuline, vulpine, angelic lapsed, etc.

These Indians understood and practised spiritism far better than the moderns. According to Mr. Parkman's account of their theory, inanimate things as rocks, trees, and lakes, as well as animals, had spirits dwelling in them, and these became the companions, mediums, of men. The land of spirits was often the very neighborhood of the wigwam, specially was it for the spirits of the old and of the children, who were too feeble to get off to a full heaven.

"The sorcerer [or spiritualist] by charms, magic songs, magic feasts and the beating of his drum had power over the spirits. . . . There was a peculiar practice of divination very general in the Algonquin family of tribes, among some of whom it still subsists. A small conical lodge was made by planting poles in a circle, lashing the tops together at the height of about seven feet from the ground, and closely covering them with hides. The prophet crawled in, and closed the aperture after him. He then beat his drum and sang his magic songs to summon the spirits, whose weak, shrill voices were soon heard, mingled with his lugubrious

chanting, while at intervals the juggler paused to interpret these communications to the attentive crowd seated on the ground without." *Do.*, pp. 84, 85.

"Here we have the "circle," "medium," "shrill voices" of the spirits," "communications," and the interpretation of them to "the attentive crowd." This is original spiritism, and, we submit, better than the corrupted modern article, inasmuch as voices are more sensible means of communication than rappings and table-tippings.

Truly this is an age of profound and original investigation. In the new theories of preëxistence, the development of man from the ape, and spiritism, our deep thinkers and men of progress have almost come up with the North American Indians.

SUNSHINE IN THE CATACOMBS. Among all that has been written of the spiritual beauty of the early Christian character and life, we know of nothing more attractive than this surprising testimony which we have somewhere found—that, amidst the innumerable inscriptions of the Roman Catacombs, no word of bitterness, vindictiveness, or sorrow is seen on those monuments, although the Christians were driven thither by fiercest persecution, to find alike a place to worship and to be buried. So cheerful was their habitual temper, that they wreathed Christ's head with a monumental crown of flowers instead of thorns, in representing his dying anguish; and funeral days were scenes of holy thanksgiving.

HOW WOULD IT WORK? We notice that many of the churches paid their pastors through the war, and still pay, the nominal sum of their contract. With the increase of prices, this is paying about fifty *per cent.* (a little less) of what they promised, since their promise was a specie and an equity promise. Many pastors are likely still to be half paid in reality, though fully paid nominally.

But ministers are scarce, while many of the churches are talking of the plan of one sermon a day. Why not give a pastor two churches? He could preach one sermon a day to each, and by the united salaries of each, on the old rates of contract, he might just live, as he managed to before the war.